

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA  
DEPARTMENT OF ARCHAEOLOGY  
CENTRAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL  
LIBRARY

---

CLASS \_\_\_\_\_

CALL No 025.3 Jol

D.G.A. 79.





THE PRINCIPLES OF CATALOGUING



CROSBY LOCKWOOD'S  
NEW LIBRARIANSHIP SERIES  
*General Editor: Robert L. Collison, F.L.A.*

LIBRARY ASSISTANCE TO READERS by Robert L. Collison. 3rd Edition. 149 pages. Illustrated. 13s. 6d.

BE A LIBRARIAN: A guide to careers in modern librarianship by C. W. H. Currie, M.A., LL.B. (Cantab.), F.L.A., Librarian, Imperial College of Science and Technology. 104 pages. Illustrated. 12s. 6d.

INFORMATION SERVICE IN LIBRARIES by D. J. Foskett, M.A., F.L.A., Librarian, Institute of Education, University of London. 152 pages. 13s. 6d.

THE PRINCIPLES OF CATALOGUING by L. Jolley, M.A., Librarian of the University of Western Australia. 154 pages. 15s.

LIBRARY ADMINISTRATION by R. N. Lock, F.L.A., Lecturer-in-Charge, School of Librarianship, City of Birmingham College of Commerce. 144 pages. 15s.

*In preparation*

CLASSIFICATION IN LIBRARIES: A textbook for students by W. B. Paton, F.L.A., County Librarian, Lanarkshire, Hon. Secretary of the Library Association (1961).

HOSPITAL LIBRARIES by Gilbert Barker.

All books will be cloth bound, Large Crown 8vo. (8 ins. by 5½ ins.), about 120 pages, in most cases illustrated, and at prices ranging from 10s. 6d. to 15s.

# THE PRINCIPLES OF CATALOGUING

L. JOLLEY

M.A., F.L.A.

*Librarian of the  
University of Western Australia*

11494

With a Foreword by

R. O. MacKENNA, M.A., A.L.A.,

*Librarian, University of Glasgow*



283.12  
Jol

1961

CROSBY LOCKWOOD & SON LTD  
26 OLD BROMPTON ROAD · LONDON · S.W.7

© CROSBY LOCKWOOD & SON LTD 1960

*First Published 1960*

*Reprinted 1961*

CENTRAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL  
LIBRARY, NEW DELHI.

Acc. No. .... 11492

Date. .... 21.9.62

Ex. No. .... 028.3

JOL

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY  
FLETCHER AND SON LTD NORWICH

## FOREWORD

THERE has been within the last twenty years a remarkable re-awakening of interest in the fundamental theory of cataloguing. The movement has been international in scale: various countries have revised or are in process of revising their codes, and IFLA has been encouraged to explore the possibility of establishing an international code—or at least to organize a search for common principles on which to base a reconciliation of conflicting national systems.

So far as concerns the English-speaking world, the bulk of the published work on these problems has been American. It began with criticism of the preliminary edition of the American revision of the joint code, published in 1941, and was still in the stage of destructive criticism when the final edition appeared in 1949. Seymour Lubetzky's *Cataloging rules and principles* (1953) brought this phase to an end, and pointed the way to reconstruction based on thinking things out afresh from first principles. British librarians were later in the field, and, although much fruitful thinking has been done, their published contribution to discussion on the subject has so far been relatively slight.

It is that which makes Mr Jolley's book so important and so welcome. This is not another exposition of the existing code, but a penetrating analysis of basic principles that could well serve as the foundation for (as Mr Jolley himself has elsewhere phrased it) a really sustained effort to evolve a new detailed practice. Sustained close reasoning of the intensity to be found here makes considerable demands upon the reader's powers of concentration; but any practising cataloguer who follows the thread of argument conscientiously throughout will emerge from the experience with a deepened comprehension of what his work is really about, and with the knowledge that whenever in future he meets a really tricky problem he can turn again to this book with a sure

hope of finding, not perhaps the answer on a plate, but—what is more important—the essential tools to help him reach it by his own efforts.

To have been asked to contribute this foreword is an honour which I appreciate very deeply—all the more because it provides an opportunity of wishing the book the success which, in my opinion, it so richly deserves.

R. O. MacKENNA.

#### PUBLISHER'S NOTE TO REPRINT

The opportunity has been taken to correct minor errors in the first edition.

We wish to state that the author was not responsible for the compilation of the index to the first edition and, in view of adverse criticism, a new index compiled by Dr. Muriel Lock has been substituted in this reprint.

## *Contents*

<i>Chapter</i>	<i>Page</i>
Foreword	v
Preface	viii
1 The Function of the Catalogue	i
2 The Author Catalogue	12
3 Corporate Authorship	56
4 The Subject Catalogue	98
5 Descriptive Cataloguing and Other Considerations	126
6 References	140
Index	143

## AUTHOR'S PREFACE

IT would be impossible to acknowledge all the sources which I have contributed to the making of this book. The time has not yet come to attempt a critical history of the current re-thinking of cataloguing principles. When such a history does come to be written there will be little room for cries of *perant qui ante nos* or for the attribution of priorities. Cataloguing is one of those fields of human endeavour in which it may be safely assumed that if an idea is worth having it will have occurred to more than one person.

No writer on cataloguing can fail to owe much to Cutter who, if he often fails to propose the correct solution, almost always shows that he has glimpsed it. Like everyone else I have been greatly influenced by the writings of Seymour Lubetzky. To Andrew Osborn I owe a more personal debt. It was a brief conversation with him more than a dozen years ago which first brought cataloguing before me, not as the tedious burden on the memory of the library school, but as a source of intellectual excitement and satisfaction. It is a great gratification to me that the lapse of time and chance has brought me to be Andrew Osborn's colleague in another sphere which is also profiting much from his great qualities of insight and imaginative leadership.

But the main source of this work has been not theory but practice. Its true begetter is the University of Glasgow Library. It first took shape as a programme for the revision of the catalogue of that Library and almost every sentence has been discussed as a working guide to immediate decisions. My greatest debt is to the searching criticism of Miss Jean Campbell, Mrs Marjorie Steel and above all of R. O. MacKenna. To them and to all who have worked on the Glasgow University Library catalogue whatever is valuable in this little book must rightly be attributed.

## CHAPTER ONE

### *The Function of the Catalogue*

THE cataloguer's art is not in general held in high esteem either by the users of the catalogue or by new entrants to the profession of librarianship. Both tend to think of cataloguing as an essentially simple process which cataloguers render unnecessarily difficult. Many commercial and scientific readers tend to speak of the catalogue as "the card index" with the implication that cataloguing is merely one form of filing. More informed critics complain that cataloguers spend their time in the meticulous study of minor points which are of no practical importance, and in the careful application of elaborate distinctions without question as to their point or use. Such criticism is not entirely without foundation. The work of the cataloguer demands great accuracy and a constant attention to many points of detail. It is easy to devote so much attention to the quality of execution of the work that no energy is left for considering the object of the work. The young cataloguer is discouraged when every mistake is considered equally culpable and no opening is provided for initiative and imagination. His discouragement is a lamentable and unnecessary waste for there is no aspect of librarianship which has greater need of initiative and imagination and which offers more scope for real scholarship than cataloguing.

That this should be so is not surprising for it is the function of the catalogue to interpret the library to the reader. It is not necessary to stress the importance of the catalogue. No large library can function without an adequate catalogue and in almost every library the use which can be made of the library's resources depends very largely on the quality of its catalogue. The function of a library is to provide a reader with the books he needs and it is the catalogue which makes possible the discharge



of this function by bringing the reader's needs into relation with the resources of the library. Other instruments pursue the same end—classification, display, the personal knowledge of members of staff—but the catalogue is more important than any of these because it is more permanent, more exhaustive and more precise. It is not surprising that many libraries take steps to ensure that a copy of the catalogue will be preserved if disaster should overtake the library. The catalogue is the record of what has gone into the building of a library and can, if need arises, be the guide to its reconstruction.

The catalogue is an instrument of communication. Its function is to communicate information about the books it records. If it fails to supply information then it fails to discharge its function. This does not necessarily mean that it is an imperfect instrument. Even the best instrument will not function if it is incorrectly used. It does mean that in designing a catalogue the cataloguer must concern himself primarily with the object of communication. Anything of whatever nature which distracts from the achievement of this object is to be condemned.

It is widely believed that for most of the first half of this century cataloguers were distracted from their chief end and became absorbed in the development of the catalogue for its own sake. Certainly the cataloguer who held that a catalogue entry should be so designed as to enable a bibliographer to use it as a substitute for actual examination of the book, or the other cataloguer who defended the retention of authors' dates in Library of Congress headings on the ground that these dates were often more accurate than those to be found in reference books, was not thinking of the catalogue primarily as a tool for providing the user with the information he needs. But the weakness of the ALA rules springs from other causes than an undue attention to form and style in cataloguing, qualities which in moderation are eminently desirable. In part they spring from a failure of nerve. The growth of co-operative cataloguing made it seem essential that cataloguers in different libraries should select

the same heading for the same book. The ALA code tries to secure this by providing specific rules for almost every difficulty which a cataloguer may meet. It fails to be exhaustive and what is more important it fails to present an orderly and consistent development of a few leading principles. It is not necessary at this date to enlarge on the deficiencies of the code. There is general agreement that it is cluttered up with overlapping and redundant rules. Its specificity leads to the multiplication of exceptions to rules and even to exceptions to exceptions, whilst the unity of broad categories is obscured. There are two distinct and in part contradictory roots for all the weaknesses. One is the anxiety to possess a "correct" answer to all difficulties and "correct" answers are constantly given without any explanation of the relevance of their correctness to the function of the catalogue. The other is the continuance of the tradition stemming from Cutter which permits a valid principle to be abandoned whenever it is thought that its maintenance will result in a heading which will not seem "natural" to a reader.

The ALA code is now being revised. There are two impulses behind its revision. American library administrators have been worried by the constant increase in cataloguing costs and the inability of cataloguing staffs to keep pace with accessions. High cost is not necessarily an indication of inefficiency. The various electronic information retrieval devices which are being experimented with are a good deal more expensive than a conventional catalogue. More important is the growing dissatisfaction of cataloguers with their own work. Despite its elaboration the catalogue was not functioning as well as it should. It was not merely that the reader sometimes found it a slow and difficult business to extract the information he needed. It was not impossible on occasions for cataloguers themselves to have difficulties in answering apparently simple questions from their own catalogue. As far as the subsequent move towards "simplified cataloguing" was simply an administrative effort to reduce expense it did not necessarily involve any question of principle. It

is possible to decide to cut out certain features of a catalogue without necessarily altering the concept of the desirable catalogue. The catalogue may function in its truncated state but if it functions less efficiently the real answer is to increase the funds available for the cataloguing department. The cataloguer's approach to simplified cataloguing is quite different. The cataloguer endeavours to define the objects of the catalogue and to distinguish the means by which these objects can be most economically achieved. If he rejects parts of existing practice it is because he considers either that they are irrelevant to the attainment of these objects or actually harmful.

The object of the catalogue is to serve the needs of the reader. What questions may a reader legitimately put to the catalogue? Surely none which is not directly related to the tracing of books. In this sense at least a catalogue is a "finding list". The implications of this position will be developed in the next chapter. But the catalogue is not concerned solely with tracing a particular book. It serves to answer the questions: Is this book in the library? What editions of this book are in the library? What books by this author are in the library? Not all these questions are of equal importance and not all can be answered with equal certainty. The second question hides a multitude of snares which will also be considered later. In general, however, it would be agreed that a catalogue should answer all these questions and that most of the difficulties of cataloguing spring from the fact that the entry which will answer the first question most directly will not always answer the second or third. Books may change titles from edition to edition and authors names.

It is the necessity of answering all these questions that prevents the adoption of one method of disposing of cataloguing difficulties which is sometimes urged by interested readers and even by some cataloguers. It is admitted that it is often extremely difficult to know which is the correct heading under which to enter a book and still more difficult to know which will be the heading under which the reader will look. Why not then adopt the prac-

## THE FUNCTION OF THE CATALOGUE

tice of the annual indexes issued by the book trade and enter under all headings under which a reader could possibly look without worrying too much about the choice of a main entry? If this practice were adopted it would certainly be possible to answer the question "Is this book in the library?" It might, however, be a very tedious business to answer the two remaining questions as different editions of a book might be entered under different forms of title or under editor or author and the same author might be entered under various forms of his name. It would indeed be possible to assemble all the information needed but only by following a multitudinous labyrinth of cross-references. In addition it must be remembered that every non-essential entry adds to the size of the catalogue. This is not merely a problem for the library administrator. After a certain point which the catalogues of all large libraries have already passed any increase in the size of the catalogue tends to lead to an increase in the difficulty of use. The multiplicity of title entries which American cataloguers make use of certainly facilitates the finding of particular books but by so greatly increasing the size of the catalogue it possibly does more than counterbalance this service.

Amongst cataloguers there are two trends in the approach towards the new ideal of the catalogue. All are agreed on the necessity for a catalogue code to be drawn up with the function of the catalogue constantly in view, and for the new code to possess a simpler more coherent and more logical structure. The divergence arises over the extent to which logic and consistency can be taken as immutable guides. The sharp controversy over "form headings" and Lubetzky's denunciation of the concept of "natural headings" springs from different attitudes to this question. Lubetzky feels that the catalogue will be a more efficient instrument if it is based on the consistent development of a few well defined principles. His opponents are prepared when such consistency results in a heading which seems unlikely to be of practical utility to depart from first principles and substitute a "natural heading". This controversy will be considered in more

detail in connection with specific examples. It will then be necessary to try to decide how far the "natural heading" is merely a revival of Cutter's practice of deferring to the alleged preferences of the reader. It is clear that in one sense all catalogues must be based on the user's habits. This does not mean that the way to construct a better catalogue is to study readers' approach to the present catalogue and modify the rules to fit in with what is discovered. Such counting of heads is of little value as it takes no account either of the quality of the heads or of the source of what information they contain. The method a reader adopts for seeking information is determined primarily by the sources of his information although it is often modified by his carelessness or special interests. The cataloguer works from the actual book he is describing. His aim is to provide a description which will be related to the other descriptions of the book which the reader is likely to encounter. These sources are very varied and very variable but together they form the whole nexus of bibliographic references of which the catalogue is but a part. The catalogue is an instrument of communication and all instruments of communication like language itself are social habits. The catalogue use process is a social habit. If the social habit is a simple one it is possible to inculcate a completely new habit in a very short time—a road traffic signal is an obvious example. The catalogue is an extremely complex communication system. It must therefore be based on existing habits. This is not to say that it must follow them blindly. The library catalogue is the most highly organized section of the whole network of bibliographic references, but it is not an independent section. The task of the cataloguer is to select and develop the elements of consistency and logic in the existing habits. He cannot impose completely new habits. To this extent then all headings must be natural headings if they are to serve their purpose. In a closed system any conventional device can be employed to identify a book. The consecutive numbering of reports issued by a research organization or even the systems of coloured signals used by some organizations to

indicate the origin of documents are obvious examples. The cataloguer in a general library works in an open system where he cannot disregard the habits of publishers or even of compilers of telephone directories. The relevance of this statement is more obvious in a country such as Brazil where it remains often extremely difficult to determine what part of a man's name forms the surname, but it applies to more than names. It is a comparatively recent and European convention to regard the author as the most important distinguishing feature of a book. Most medieval western lists give books under titles and this is still the practice of some twentieth century Arabic cataloguers. The starting point of any catalogue is contemporary convention. The cataloguer codifies existing practice. Codification is the precise and explicit development of principles already imperfectly and uncertainly present. It implies not grouping books according to the most specific peculiarities they may have in common with other books but arranging them in broad classes embodying the same basic principle. A code which encourages the cataloguer and the user to treat their material according to its essential characteristics will be easier to apply and to use than one which attempts to deal with every possible form of published matter from spirit communications to reports of cemetery associations and Luther Colleges. It may not ensure that different cataloguers will always arrive at the same method of treating the same material, but the ALA code gives plenty of opportunities for cataloguers to differ.

The catalogue is the codification of practice. It is not the development of first principles. The cataloguer is a social scientist not a philosopher. If a certain practice establishes itself decisively he follows it. There are many possible ways of cataloguing periodicals which can be justified by logical argument. The existence of the *World List of Scientific Periodicals* and similar works has rendered these arguments unnecessary. Every scientific reader and many a non-scientific reader now thinks of the journals he needs in terms of their title or an abbreviation of their

title. Title entry has always been a possible method but it is the practice of scientific writers which has now made it the almost universally accepted method. It can easily be shown to have many disadvantages in certain instances but when a new habit of reference is developing it is the task of the cataloguer to assist and not to hinder. Above all the cataloguer must not regard the more satisfactory treatment of a particular instance as being more important than the consistent treatment of a whole class. When a journal changes its name frequently it is more convenient to enter under the body responsible for the journal than under the title. It is much easier to deal with the quick changes of title of what was once the *American Journal of Diseases of Children* if the entry is under American Medical Association. It is not, however, possible to divide journals into those with fixed and variable titles. To enter under American Medical Association is perhaps to deal in the best way with this particular case, but it is to introduce a principle of confusion into the catalogue. It may, however, be possible to define a whole class of periodicals which are best entered under the body issuing them. Annual reports possess two characteristics. They usually contain administrative matter and are always the official pronouncement of the issuing body. In addition they often possess titles which are not permanent. A secretary may without thought change from "Annual report" to "Report for the year" and back again. The *World List* solves the problem of annual reports in a different way the merits of which do not need discussing at this point. The position which is being put forward is not that the cataloguer should follow the practice of any authority which has sufficient weight. This would be futile as there is usually another authority to be cited on the other side. It is that when some authority has established a bibliographical habit which is both consistent and satisfactory then the cataloguer should follow this habit. He is fully justified in using his own judgement in developing or modifying this habit if he can show that his modification is not put forward on purely subjective grounds, but can be made the basis of a con-

sistent general practice. When an objectively definable class of works is concerned it is perfectly justifiable to divide it off for more satisfactory treatment. It is making an exception for a special case (in the interests of an apparent immediate utility) which weakens the catalogue.

A different question which raises issues of fundamental importance is the character of the sources of the catalogue entry. The cataloguer works first from the book before him. That can never be the sole source of his information. He must always consult his own catalogue, otherwise the same author may appear under two distinct forms of name, perhaps in one case with initials and in the other full forenames. The limited cataloguing of the Library of Congress permits such a reference to the library's own catalogue but lays down that apart from this all the information must be obtained from the book itself. Much information which users have expected to find in catalogues can only be gathered from very varied sources. The book itself will usually contain no indication that the author's name is a pseudonym or that the work has previously been issued under another name. The fact that two societies with quite distinct names are in fact the same society at different stages of its existence may be very difficult to establish. How wide should the cataloguer spread his investigations and how much time should he spend on them? Clearly he cannot continue until he has convinced himself that he has exhausted all possibilities of establishing the full facts. A bibliographer may devote a lifetime to the study of one author and still be left with many problems which only chance can solve. The cataloguer is not a research worker and indeed to describe his investigations as researches—a common practice—is a misuse of terms. Research is the bringing to light of knowledge which is either new or has been forgotten. This cannot be the cataloguer's task because he has not the time in which to carry it out properly. It follows that the catalogue can often answer only very imperfectly the two questions "What editions of this book are in the library?" or "What books by this



author are in the library?" Unsuspected pseudonyms may be as common as unsuspected murders. The catalogue is not a record of original researches but it may perhaps be expected to reproduce in addition to the information contained in the book whatever other relevant facts are readily accessible. "Readily accessible" is a very vague term and indeed must be interpreted according to the character and situation of the library in which the cataloguer is working. A cataloguer in a large academic library may reasonably be expected to consult the relevant national bibliographies, biographical reference works and catalogues of national libraries. Must he go on and consult specialist author and subject bibliographies? And what if these give contradictory information? No authority is infallible and even the catalogues of the great national libraries all contain a fair sprinkling of sheer misinformation. It is difficult enough to try to bring together all the work of one author. It is far harder to relate all the editions of one work. What is the definition of one work? If the cataloguer is not to become a literary historian he must restrict himself to the task, difficult enough in itself, of relating works with exactly the same content which have different titles or works which have varying contents with the same title, unless a work which varies both in title and content carries in itself an indication of relationship to the other work. Even if the cataloguer is personally a historian he must not utilize in the catalogue any new discoveries he may make. The cataloguer deals not in new facts but in generally accepted data. He therefore restricts his investigations to works which have acquired the status of standard works of reference. This restriction does not of course apply to the cataloguer of a special collection. He is in the happy position of creating a standard reference work and may legitimately pursue researches as far as his opportunities allow. But the cataloguer in the general library must deny himself all this. He must deal not with things as they are but as they are generally taken to be.

It has been said that the catalogue is part of the whole network of bibliographical references. It is part also of the wider network

of general reference works and cannot function independently of them. If a reader comes across a reference to "the devastating reply composed by the Paymaster General to the Forces" he will need to consult some other reference work before he can discover from the catalogue whether this work is in the library. "The learned work of Bishop Williams" will again be hard to find unless some further details are acquired about Bishop Williams. Even an apparently straightforward name may need elucidation. A reference to Chaloner Smith in the standard art reference dictionary omits the essential fact that the full name is John Chaloner Smith. No catalogue can function on its own and almost certainly the catalogue would carry out its own function more effectively if it left more of its peripheral work to other sources. It is not even certain that the tracing of references from different forms of names is always a task for the catalogue. In cases such as some mediaeval or Arabic names either of authors or of books, the possible variants on a name may be very great. Could not the cataloguer choose the name which is generally preferred and leave the elucidation of the lesser used forms to the appropriate reference book? Perhaps he would have to add a reference from the actual form used in the book being catalogued. Current catalogue codes prescribe entries under almost all recorded forms of names, but since the original texts will be asked for by those who are familiar with the authors and modern translations by those who will know only the accepted modern name the value of these numerous references from variant forms seems doubtful. After all no catalogue would attempt to list all recorded sixteenth or seventeenth century spellings of contemporary names. The exact applications of the principle are open to argument but there can be no doubt that cataloguers would save much trouble if they ceased to look on the catalogue as a reference tool always complete in itself.

## CHAPTER TWO

### *The Author Catalogue*

THE author catalogue is the primary catalogue in almost all libraries. Even when a dictionary catalogue in which author and subject entries are arranged in one alphabetical sequence is used the author entry provides the main entry. In recent discussion of cataloguing it is the author catalogue which has almost monopolized attention. There is an obvious reason for this primacy of the author catalogue. The author entry is usually more definite than the subject entry. There will often be uncertainty as to the best choice of an author heading but the choice is between clearly defined possibilities. Frequently it is extremely difficult or indeed impossible to define the precise subject of a book. The reader who possesses full details of a book will more easily discover the book in a catalogue through the author entry than the subject entry. It is the author catalogue therefore which provides the intellectual inventory of the library. Many great libraries function without a subject catalogue but no great library can be conducted without an author catalogue.

A variant of the author catalogue which is almost confined to Great Britain is the "name catalogue". This is an author catalogue which includes references from all names which occur in titles. It is a type of catalogue which has not been the subject of much theoretical discussion and the exact details of application vary from library to library. Most frequently added entries are made for all names except when the names are used purely to determine a chronological period and often added entries are made when the name though not stated is clearly implied in some word or phrase. It is easy to see that the name catalogue is indefensible on purely logical grounds. Most of these added entries are clearly

subject entries. Some are neither author nor subject entries, e.g. an entry under Sir Robert Peel for "*A letter to Sir Robert Peel*". All this does not necessarily lead us to dismiss the "name catalogue" as a useless survival from an age of less exact cataloguing. Concealed subject entries in an author catalogue are bad because they lead to uncertainty. A carefully defined group of subject entries is not open to this objection. It may seem muddled to mix subject and author entries. The advantage of so doing springs from the fact that there are some books which the user is unlikely to find whatever form of author entry is made for them. The easiest approach is by subject. The name catalogue is perhaps a restricted form of dictionary catalogue but its restrictions do not render it useless. It is within the capacity of libraries which would find the provision of a full subject catalogue outside their resources and the very restriction of its scope enables it to fulfil its limited function more precisely than the larger and necessarily more imperfect subject catalogue.

In any case the term author catalogue is of course an abbreviation. No author catalogue consists solely of author entries. All books must have authors but in many cases the name of the author is unknown and in others the responsibility for the book is divided up in such a way that no suitable name can be found to provide a heading under which entry can be made. In consequence the codes for author catalogues describe themselves as rules for "author and title entries". In actual fact they devote considerable space to prescribing rules for entries which are neither author nor title. The validity of such entries has been questioned. In particular Lubetzky has argued strongly that a cataloguing code must be based on firm principles. All books possess an author or a title and entry should be under one or the other. To depart from this basis is to invite confusion. This is a contention which has aroused fierce discussion but reflection and experience show that it holds good. Cataloguing has been defined in the previous chapter as the codification of existing practice, and codification means that the same treatment must

be applied to the same classes of books and that these classes must be defined by as broad and objectively stated criteria as possible. To seek for apparent utility by sacrificing consistency is to introduce that element of fundamental uncertainty which vitiates so much cataloguing. This is not necessarily to accept entirely Lubetzky's application of his principles. Most books possess titles but in some cases the title is not a suitable basis for a heading. Cataloguing practice has long recognized this fact and many books which possess neither a known author nor a fixed title are entered under what is known as "a conventional title". It is hard to see in what other way it would be possible to catalogue such books as the Bible or the mediaeval anonymous poems. Lubetzky's principles could therefore be amended to read: "All books must be entered under either the author or the title or, in certain precisely defined circumstances, under a recognized extension of one of these features". It might be thought that such a rephrasing opens the back door into chaos after ostentatiously shutting the front. It is, one hopes, a little better than this. It acknowledges that the universally accepted pattern of bibliographical references does use entry under headings which are neither strictly author nor title. It seeks to restrict the occasions on which such entries may be made and to limit the character of the headings which may be used to recognizable extensions of the title or author.

It is perhaps useful here to consider what is meant by the term "author". It has been argued that it is the accepted practice to enter primarily under the author only because the author's name is the one most permanently and consistently associated with a book. This contention cannot be upheld as it stands. Carlyle's *Life of Sterling* is as permanently associated with Sterling as with Carlyle. We enter a book primarily under its author because in our present stage of civilization individual intellectual responsibility for a book is considered to possess a special importance. We think of books first as the works of individual authors. This has not always been the case. Some twentieth century Arabic

catalogues list books under their titles and from the title pages of some Jewish works in which the different layers of commentaries and text and super-commentaries are inextricably mingled it is impossible to tell who is claimed to be the author of the work which follows. The mediaeval concept of translation is far from precise. The practice of later centuries is clearly to think of *The Iliad* as the work of Homer even though Pope's name may be as permanently and consistently associated with the version under discussion.

Intellectual responsibility is therefore the primary criterion of authorship but cataloguing practice has certainly extended the term author to cover a name permanently and consistently associated with a work. It is better to recognize and try to define this extension rather than to try to force the concept of intellectual responsibility. It is general practice to enter the catalogue of a library under the name of a library. The problems of corporate authorship are best postponed. Here one needs only remark that it is possible though rather forced to equate the library staff with the library and claim that the library is therefore the "author" of the catalogue. Some such reasoning must be behind ALA 13C which provides for entry under the author of an unofficial catalogue. It is not, however, pursued consistently for 13 A prescribes that catalogues of private collections are to be entered under the name of the owner of the collection with added entry under the name of the compiler. As the owner of the collection may even be dead when the catalogue appears there can be no real question of intellectual responsibility. An over-refined argument might be that the owner of the collection is responsible for making the collection and therefore determines the basic material of the catalogue. Much the same argument might persuade one that the subject of a biography is really the ultimate author. It is better simply to admit that this is a case where the chosen heading is not an author heading. It still remains the best heading not because it provides the easiest way of finding the catalogue but because any other heading would almost certainly separate

two different editions of the same work. The catalogues of libraries are frequently issued in different forms over the years. The compilers even if known will change and the title may well change. The catalogues themselves change too but universal bibliographical practice regards them as different issues of a single entity and would consider it absurd if they were scattered through the catalogue under different headings. This then may be taken as the criterion of the permissibility of entries which are neither author or title. The use of some other heading which is neither author or title may be permitted when it serves to bring together different editions of the same work which would have been scattered through the catalogue if either a title heading or an author heading based solely on the concept of intellectual responsibility had been used. This is the generally accepted concept of a conventional title. It is rather difficult to accept the name of a collector or a library as a title in any understandable sense of the word and it might be better to coin the phrase "conventional author".

The full discussion of this concept belongs to the chapter on corporate authorship. The question to be asked at present is simply "Does the use of 'conventional titles' and 'conventional authors' invalidate the whole 'authorship principle' as a basis for the catalogue?" It has been claimed that this principle which is clear enough in the case of a book by a single author becomes more and more tenuous as it is pursued through joint authorship multiple authorship, anonymous works, etc. and finally vanishes completely as a reliable guide. The truth would appear to be that although the "authorship principle" does become more and more tenuous it still survives as a guiding thread. The cataloguer and the user of the catalogue both recognize that the name of a library when used as a heading for the entry recording its catalogue is not a subject heading. To the cataloguer the term "author" implies the concept of both intellectual responsibility and of the name most permanently and consistently associated with a work. In a few carefully defined cases the second element

alone, or almost alone, may be present. The standard in the light of which all cases must be judged is that both elements must be present. Intellectual responsibility by itself is not adequate. A work of composite authorship can usually not be entered under any of those intellectually responsible because no name can be found which is permanently and consistently associated with the work.

If the concept of authorship in the first sense is discarded then confusion not simplification follows. The concept of "the name most permanently and consistently associated with the work" is in fact the guiding principle of many nineteenth century catalogues. In such catalogues it is the universal practice for anonymous biographies to be entered under the subject and it is not unknown for the subject to be preferred even when the author's name is given in the book. It is possible to find a report of a committee formed to combat the proposals of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland entered under the General Assembly. Such catalogues only exhibit in a more uninhibited form characteristics which can be found to some extent in the British Museum catalogue itself. Because there is no guiding principle other than the idea of "association" there is no precision in these catalogues. There are many entries which can only be found by a tedious process of trial and error. The readiness of some catalogue reformers to blur unnecessarily the distinction between author and subject in the interest of alleged "natural headings" might be checked if these reformers had worked for years with catalogues in which such simplification had been taken for granted.

The object of the cataloguer is, of course, to produce headings under which the reader will naturally look. The cataloguer achieves this object most successfully if he adheres consistently to first principles provided that these principles are well chosen and are based on a thorough analysis of accepted habits of bibliographical reference. If he finds that the results of the application of his principles appear unsatisfactory then he starts again to think



over his principles. He does not make an exception in order to enter some material "under the heading where the reader will naturally look". It was Cutter who first exalted the convenience of the reader over every other consideration and demanded that the cataloguer must bow to general and deeply rooted habits even at the cost of system and simplicity. The ALA code paraphrased Cutter when (p. xx) it laid down that exceptions and qualifications are to be made when too strict an application of a general rule would result in a heading not giving the most direct approach. To reject this principle is not to place the cataloguer's ease above the utility of the catalogue.

This point is of such fundamental importance that it is worth illustrating at length. Two instances are of occasions where the Joint Code and the ALA rules unite in rejecting the heading which at first examination appears most convenient. Most early British catalogues and the present-day codes of some European countries unite in entering an anonymous biography under the name of the subject. The arguments in favour of such a course are obvious. This is the name with which everyone seeking the book will be familiar. The exact wording of the title may have been forgotten or, what is more important, may never have been given at all. *A brief account of the life of Thomas Stubbs* may be referred to by a conscientious author as "the anonymous life of Stubbs". Add to this the difficulty that a publisher who suspected that the poor sales of the book were due to its over modest title might well reissue it as "*The life of Thomas Stubbs*". Why should the reader look in one case under "Brief" and in the other under "Life"? The name which is permanently associated with the book is that of Thomas Stubbs. It must be accepted that the overwhelming majority of readers will trace this book under Stubbs—either a subject heading in a dictionary catalogue or a name reference in a name catalogue. In a pure author catalogue which strictly followed the ALA rules the correct entry would be buried for most readers. Is there any justification for a practice which makes a work really accessible only by a subsidiary entry?

Considered in isolation the answer to this question is a clear no. But, analysed from the viewpoint of distinctive features of authorship and title, anonymous biographies do not form a coherent and well-defined group. They form part of the larger group "anonymous works which contain proper nouns in the title", and this group merges into the concept "anonymous works which contain memorable words in the title". The various treatments of title entry will be considered later. The point to be established is that anonymous biographies cannot be treated as a distinct class of works. The exception to entry under either author or title which was permitted earlier was a case where such entry would scatter different editions of the same work under different headings and where the "conventional title" or "conventional author" entry would bring them together. Entry under the subject of a biography is too broad to satisfy this criterion. The anonymous lives brought together under one subject will include many different works most of which will be better kept together by a single title entry.

It is the practice of the British Museum and many other British academic libraries including some which in general follow the Joint Code to enter a *Festschrift* under the name of the person to whom the *Festschrift* is dedicated. This again is apparently a very natural heading in that it is certainly the one which would occur first to most readers. A *Festschrift* rarely has one editor, it frequently adopts a formal fixed title "Essays and studies presented to ...". The most memorable feature is certainly the name of the recipient. Again the answer is that a *Festschrift* is not a work which exhibits distinctive peculiarities which can guide the cataloguer. The Museum rule (15a) itself makes this clear. It "does not extend to memorial volumes and centenary publications". As a *Festschrift* is not usually presented to a man until he is well on in years there must have been many a work planned as a *Festschrift* which finished up as a memorial volume. It is difficult to find any naturalness in a rule which enjoins the different cataloguing of a composite work presented to a living

man from a similar work in honour of a dead man. Life and death are bibliographically irrelevant facts. The point which the British Museum rule brings out so pointedly is constantly demonstrated in experience. There is a gradation from collective essays presented to a man to collective essays about a man, and it is impossible in many cases to say to which side of the dividing line any one work lies.

The third instance is from the current (1957) practice of the Library of Congress. Formerly the Library of Congress entered the Oxford Books of Verse under the compiler. It now enters them under the title. Certainly the title is better known. Most readers will have difficulty in recalling the names of the compilers of most Oxford Books. In some cases a second edition is prepared by a different editor. And yet this change cannot be justified. Anthologies belong to a clearly defined group. They are selections made by one—or more—man from the works of others. It is the selector who has made the actual anthology, although the material from which he has made it is the work of others. He then is the author and the work should be entered under his name. If there is more than one selector then the usual rules for joint and multiple authorship apply. It might be possible to argue that all anthologies and selections of all kinds should be entered under the title and this point will be taken up later, but it is not possible to decide to enter an anthology under title simply because it is believed that the title is better known.

It must be constantly remembered that the catalogue is itself a major instrument in determining a reader's concept of a natural heading. If the catalogue abandons consistency in the treatment of the same type of material in favour of an apparent temporary utility the user finds no consistent pattern to guide him and is driven back to a "lucky dip" approach to what should be a precision instrument. In the long run it is the user who suffers most.

The rules of cataloguing can be summed up in three propositions. Enter under the author if possible. Failing author entry

enter under the title. In specifically defined cases, where this is necessary to keep together works which would otherwise be scattered, enter under a conventional extension of the author or title. These three rules may not be entirely adequate as they stand but their application to specific instances should involve development and simplification rather than abandonment in the face of apparent difficulties. Books are complex things and present themselves in many variants of a basically simple form. It is impossible to lay down specific directions for every possible variant. It is only possible to suggest an agreed approach. A common approach will not always produce an identical catalogue entry but our existing complicated rules also leave many opportunities for differences.

Of all forms of books those by a single known author might appear to present the least difficulties. It is therefore the more discouraging that the Joint Code devotes eight pages to rules for selecting such authors and the ALA rules nearly fifty. Almost all this proliferation could be avoided by the reiteration of our first principle expanded to read "Enter a work under the person primarily responsible for the work with added entry for all who have made substantial contributions to the appearance of the work in the particular form it assumes in the book being catalogued". The British Joint Code rule for the entering of thematic catalogues and concordances clearly ignores the concept of intellectual responsibility in authorship and concentrates solely on the aspect "name permanently associated with a work". The ruling is perhaps reinforced by the feeling that the kind of intellectual effort which goes into the making of a concordance is not of the same quality as that which goes to an original work. A little reflection shows that such consideration cannot have any application to the catalogue and to reverse the argument shows its folly. We cannot attribute to Shakespeare responsibility for the work of all who have listed his works. There is in fact no necessity for special rules for compilers of indexes, thematic catalogues, concordances etc. The ALA rule 12F states that a

thematic catalogue is to be entered under its compiler and that if the compiler is not known entry should be under the publisher. The first part of this rule is redundant, the second confusing. It is a fact that the names of editors of music have often been suppressed so that musicians tend to refer to an edition by the publisher rather than by an editor, a practice which is not completely unknown with ordinary books. If this practice were to be recognized, which would mean treating a musical publishing house as a corporate author and involve many contradictions and difficulties, its recognition could not be restricted to thematic catalogues. ALA 12A (2) gives the cataloguer a list of various possible relationships between the composer of an opera and the author of a libretto. It also adds the further licence of a footnote which reverses the main rule. In the great majority of cases the libretto of an opera is clearly a subordinate part of a larger work and entry should be under the composer. Very occasionally, Gilbert and Sullivan present the best known example, composer and librettist may be considered as joint authors. A literary work which has been set to music will usually be entered under the author, but if published with the music the composer of the music will take precedence. To enter an anonymous libretto under the title is the refinement of pedantry. These statements may appear to be based on nothing more than a personal answer to the Cutter question "Where will the reader look?". This is not the case. The ALA rule with its numerous examples obscures the fact that the real question which has to be asked is "What is the character of the whole work?". The answer to this cannot be found solely by an examination of the title page, important though this is, but by an examination of the whole work and the normally accepted practice of reference to it. It is not the decisions of the ALA rule which are to be questioned so much as the lack of basic principle in arriving at them. The principle that works are to be considered as a whole and that clearly subordinate parts are to be treated as such is also an adequate guide to the treatment of indexes. ALA rule 27 gives eight different divisions

of indexes and ignores the fact that bibliographically these do not form a coherent unit. Such grouping can only be of use to the cataloguer who uses the index to the rules as his guide. A periodical which contains a guide to the subject matter of books and other periodicals is still a periodical. Of monographs which take the form of an index there are two forms. The one which is most common is that in which the index clearly forms a subordinate part of the main work. Usually, but not always, an index to a single work falls into this category. Theodore Besterman's index to Arthur Upham Pope's *Survey of Persian art* although published nearly twenty years after the last volume of the text is quite plainly part of the main work and it is not certain that even an added entry under Besterman is needed. But an index to a single work need not be an obvious part of the work. It can be quite clearly an independent work. The ALA rule treats as an essential a characteristic which is indeed very common but remains accidental. Following this rule the numerous indexes to the *Divine comedy* would be entered under Dante, whilst an index which was extended to cover Dante's other poems would be entered under the compiler. The true guide is plainly to treat an index which takes the form of an independent work in the same way as any other independent work. The decision whether a work is an independent work is not always easy. The ALA rules provide no example of an independently published index to a single work of an author and such indexes are not common. Sometimes such indexes are published many years after the work indexed, and the index is plainly to be treated as an independent work. John Amphlett's *An index to Dr Nash's collections for a history of Worcestershire* being part of the Worcestershire Historical Society's Publications will be found in many libraries which do not possess Nash's *Collections* and this fact alone is a good reason for not entering under Nash. The *Analytical index to Sir John W. Kaye's History of the Sepoy War* and Col. G. B. Malleon's *History of the Indian Mutiny (combined in one volume)* by Frederick Pincott was issued with the 1896 reprinting of these

two works. The extraordinary history of these two works indexed—the publisher commissioned Malleson to continue and to contradict the work of Kaye, an odd example of a composite work clearly not joint authorship—justifies treatment of the index as an independent work.

In the same way there is no need for rules for epitomes, commentaries, translations, architects' illustration or engravers. The only new development of principle is introduced by the question of an added entry for an illustrator. ALA 19D is sound but not really necessary. All of rule 19 A-D simply states the fact that an artist may be either the author or the joint author of a work. 19E goes on to suggest that even when the illustration is clearly a subordinate feature of the work added entry should be made under the illustrator "if the illustrations are a noteworthy feature of the work". This is a difficult and ambiguous saying. Does noteworthy imply mere number or artistic merit? If the latter the cataloguer is not necessarily equipped to judge. The function of the catalogue is to record a book. If the book may reasonably be sought under the name of the illustrator then an added entry is justified. If not, then the noting of the work of any illustrator, however eminent, is not a task for the catalogue. It may very reasonably, if circumstances justify this, be entrusted to some special index similar to those which may record former owners or armorial bookplates. The compilation of such an index is a work for someone who can distinguish what is of artistic value. The cataloguer is concerned only with the judgement of probable avenues of access.

The treatment of revisions is difficult and introduces a further development which is that the cataloguer is concerned not with things as they are but as they choose to appear. ALA 20 states that a revision should be entered under the name of the original author unless the revision is substantially a new work. There are two difficulties in this rule. One is caused by the cataloguer's having to make the critical judgement as to whether a new edition is or is not substantially a new work. The other springs

from the fact that accepted practice is not in step with the rule. Some revised editions which are clearly substantially new works are universally referred to by the name of the original author.

Medical text books are constantly revised but in many cases the name of the original author is preserved. Henry Gray wrote his *Anatomy descriptive and surgical* in 1858 and died shortly after the appearance of the first edition. In the 32nd edition which appeared in 1958 the original pages have been enlarged to 1604. Quite certainly this is substantially a new work and the title has changed from "descriptive and surgical" to "descriptive and applied", but it still describes itself on the title page as *Gray's Anatomy* and is universally known by this title. There are many reasons why a work should retain its original author's name long after his influence on it has substantially disappeared. One is that his may still be the name most permanently and closely associated with the work. A succession of editors may completely change the substance of the work but none of them may be associated with it long enough to lend his own name to it. When the same editor produces a large number of revisions it will often happen that his name takes the place of the original author's, especially if the editor is anxious for this to happen and the publisher does not object. The cataloguer cannot be guided by the extent of the revision which he is not competent to judge. He is guided by the style in which the book describes itself and to a lesser extent by the way in which it is quoted by others. The position is well illustrated by the preface to the sixth edition of *A dictionary of the Maori language*. The first two editions of this work were by William Williams (1844 and 1852), the third and fourth by William Leonard Williams (1871, 1892), the fifth by Herbert William Williams (1917). After outlining this history the preface concludes "It is a pity that the traditional family association with the dictionary has been broken, but it remains Williams's Dictionary and will so remain as long as the Maori language is remembered". This brave declaration is a little spoilt by the fact that the title page of this work runs "*A dictionary*



of the Maori language by Herbert W. Williams. Sixth edition, revised and augmented under the auspices of the Polynesian Society". If it is the sixth edition then one would think the author statement should include a reference to William Williams. The point which this preface does bring out clearly is that a work may consciously and deliberately preserve the name of an original author for an indefinite time irrespective of any changes in the substance of the work. The relevant rule should therefore run "Enter a revision under the original author unless the revision assumes the form of a new work", which is only part of the general axiomatic principle to treat each book as it describes itself unless there is some strong reason to the contrary.

Before pursuing this principle further in connection with the names of authors it is necessary to consider the possibilities of joint and multiple authors.

The difficulty here is in finding a name which is closely and permanently associated with the book. The intellectual responsibility is usually quite clearly defined. The joint authorship of two writers offers no difficulty. Universal convention recognizes two names in permanent association as having the same function as a single name. This is not a cataloguer's invention but extends to legal firms, fashion shops, publishers, etc. The name associated with *Some experiences of an Irish R.M.* would never be Somerville or Ross but Somerville and Ross. Edith Somerville survived her cousin some years but what she wrote still appeared under the name of Somerville and Ross. Her justification for this is the analogy already suggested "An established firm does not change its style and title when for any reason one of its partners may be compelled to leave it. The partner who shared all things with me has left me, but the firm has not yet put up the shutters, and I feel I am justified in permitting myself the pleasure of still linking the name of Martin Ross with that of E. A. Somerville".

Dr Somerville may have been a little eccentric in her practice but her argument is sound. To enter a work by joint authors under one of them or under the title is deliberate perversity.

Names which are on readers' lips every day establish this point without the need for further argument—Mitchell and Cash, Toplay and Wilson, Allen and Unwin. To how many names does this principle extend? To three at least but beyond that it is more doubtful. It is certain that if twenty-one names appear on the title page with equal prominence their names cannot cohere to form a joint name. The ALA rules distinguish between "joint authorship" and "composite works". The reason behind the distinction is clear but has no bearing on the cataloguing problem. Twenty-one equal authors will not provide a name to attach to a work whether their contributions are merged into one whole or are separate and labelled. It may be noted that the illustrations under 3B and 4A in the ALA rules appear from the title page to be indistinguishable. In some cases one author will be given primary responsibility for the work and the book should be entered under his name whether the work of the other authors is separately distinguished or not. The title page will normally determine whether one author is more important. The editor or editors of a symposium may be taken to be particularly responsible for the book, at least when there is no question of a corporate authorship. The very great difficulties of cataloguing symposia organized under the auspices of societies will be dealt with along with the other problems of corporate entry. If it is clear that a man has planned the book as a whole then his is the name most likely to be associated with it. When, as often happens now, a book begins as a series of lectures organized by one person or corporate body and is then "edited" by another person the situation is more difficult but if the title page attributes special pre-eminence to such an editor it should be followed. Often the title page gives no certain lead. The names of the contributors may be arranged in non-alphabetical order and the first on the list may be the writer of the introductory chapter. This in itself cannot be regarded as an indication that the relationship of this contributor to the book is more intimate than that of the others. Very often works which appear in a series with a common pattern

of title are quite definitely better known by their title. Does this justify entry under the title even though there is clearly an editor who is responsible for the book? Is it not pedantic to enter *Modern trends in pediatrics* under its editor when most readers will seek it under the title? The argument seems strong but its strength dissolves on reflection. There are very many books which are better known by title. Indeed booksellers often state that most of their customers remember all books by some variant of the title if not the correct title itself. A reader thirty years ago would be more likely to look for *Highways and byways in Dorset* under the title than under the individual author. If there is any validity in the choice of a better known title in place of an editor then it would apply equally well to the book by a single author. But as the example quoted indicates series which at one time are very well known may lose their popularity. This end of the process may not trouble the cataloguer too much. He is cataloguing for immediate use and not for twenty years time. But how is he to recognize the initial stages of the process and know that a series of this character will achieve popularity. An added entry under the title or even a series entry will serve the reader who knows only the title and will avoid the ambiguities and inconsistencies into which the practice of main entry under a well-known title would lead. A series in which exactly the same title is repeated is of course in a quite different category as it is to be catalogued as a periodical even if the editors remain unchanged.

There are two ways of treating works by many authors. The one is to enter under the first named author. This, after all, is the practice in quoting periodical articles which will sometimes be the work of six or seven authors and where the title of the article is possibly shared by several other articles. The second is to enter under title. Neither method is entirely satisfactory. Title entry is entirely dependent upon the catalogue user's possession of the exact wording of the title. It is true that author entry is equally dependent upon the user's having an accurate knowledge of the spelling of the author's name and usually of his initials or given

names as well. At present writers usually quote author's names more carefully than titles. It is allowable to paraphrase a title or to introduce a reference of the type "the interesting work of Jones and other scholars which was published in 1957". One objection to entry under the first author is that the order of the authors may be changed in a later edition but this is no more likely than that the title may change. If we continue to ask the question "How can we enter a work by several authors no one of whom is more prominent than the others so that it will most easily be found?" then we shall get no certain answer. If we return to our first principles there is no longer any doubt. There is no one person who combines both the required characteristics of authorship so entry must be under the title unsatisfactory though this may sometimes be. An added entry under the first named contributor may be a permitted convenience.

A variant of composite authorship which offers some complications is when the works of different authors are brought together in a single book. There again the cataloguing of the book depends not so much on the substance of the book as on the appearance. A selection from the works of several authors made by one man will be entered under the editor but so will the complete works of three or more writers if brought together under the appearance of a new unity and provided with a common title. When no appearance of unity is created and the book is simply described as *The poems of Collins, Shenstone, and Gray* then entry must be made under each author and there would seem to be a case for treating each entry as a main entry. This would avoid the difficulty which entry under the first named author produces, a difficulty which is well illustrated in the case of a mid-nineteenth century edition of the poems of Collins and Gray which exists in two variants in the second of which the order of the poets is reversed. If, however, there is some designed relationship between the parts of the book regard must be paid to this. The Joint Code gives us an example of two books published together without a collective title. "*Carlyle's Essay on Burns, with*

*the Cottar's Saturday night and other poems from Burns; ed. with notes and an introduction by Willard C. Gore.*" Here the two works are not unrelated and the book is best treated as a selection from the poems of Burns with a prefatory essay on Burns by Carlyle. This example illustrates very clearly the distinction between the legalistic and the functional approach to a cataloguing problem.

Anonymous books cannot be entered under their authors and therefore must according to basic principles we have adopted be entered under the title. This sentence unfortunately does not dispose of all the problems of cataloguing anonymous books and these problems are of great interest in themselves and for the light they throw on the whole problem of title entry.

One point which relates to the concept of the catalogue as a self-contained unit is the treatment of anonymous books where authors are known. The majority of codes enter such works under the author but with added entry under the title. The British Museum austere restricts this practice to "recognized classics", e.g. the *Divina Commedia* and *Hamlet*. This is an ill-defined class in which *Gulliver's Travels* is not included. The Museum practice is dictated by the need to answer the question "is this book in the library?" A reader who comes across a contemporary reference to *Gulliver's Travels* will find no indication of author. The natural first reaction is to dismiss the Museum rule as unnecessary pedantry. Few readers using early eighteenth century material will be ignorant of the authorship of *Gulliver's Travels*. It must be remembered that a great library contains material on all subjects in all languages. It is therefore reasonable to proceed with caution in estimating a reader's knowledge. The real solution would seem to be not to attempt the impossible task of defining "what every reader knows" but to base cataloguing practice on what information is readily available in well-known reference books. This, after all, is what the Museum does "where for the name of an author there is substituted an official designation or description sufficiently clear to render his

identity unmistakable". In such cases the book is not regarded as anonymous, but is entered under the name of the author, without even a title reference. It will often take a little time to trace the identity of the "Chancellor of the Exchequer" and it may be quite a formidable task to identify the mayor of a small Italian town. The amendment to current practice which is suggested would leave the making of added entries under the title to the discretion of the cataloguer who would be guided primarily by the ease with which he himself found the name of the author. The wording of ALA 32 is ambiguous. If it implies that all works first published anonymously are to have an added title entry it is certainly not carried out by most libraries. Nor is there any need that it should be. It is not the function of the library catalogue to take the place of the dictionaries of *anonyma*.

Another point of interest is the distinction between an anonymous and pseudonymous book. The ALA rules class as anonymous works in which the authorship is indicated by "a generic word or phrase preceded by an article" and as pseudonymous those in which the author "*uses as a name* a specific word or phrase with or without a definite article". The italicized *uses as a name* is really the heart of the definition but it is sometimes lost sight of. Thus "Ex-Intelligence Officer", "the Duchess", "the Prig" may perhaps be specific but are they any more than "Ex-convict No.—" used as names? The British Museum rule is detailed but not helpful. "Where an author, while concealing his identity, writes under a descriptive or fictitious name, it is taken as a Heading if it takes the form of a real name, or if it consists of a single word, or of a combination that may be written as a single word (e.g. Bull's Eye which may be written Bullseye), or of a combination (such as 'Red Heather') which is not descriptive of the author but is obviously intended as a pseudonym, or of a Christian name accompanied by an epithet (e.g. Uncle John for which the form as a heading is 'JOHN, *Uncle*'); otherwise it is regarded as a circumlocution and the book treated as anonymous".

The examples which illustrate this rule are all consistent with it but do not make it more intelligible. "A Merchant" can be treated as a pseudonym but not "A Mere Merchant" or a "London Merchant". Similarly "Eye-witness" or "Major-General" are admissible but "Old Soldier" or "Kathleen's Aunt" are not. The distinction between "Uncle John" and "Kathleen's Aunt" is precise and objective but this example demonstrates that precision and objectivity are not enough to make a rule satisfactory. A rule must, if not axiomatic, at least be self-evident once it has been explained. The British Museum distinctions between pseudonymous and anonymous works are careful and precise but as they do not correspond to any general bibliographic habits they must appear arbitrary. In certain cases the result of their application becomes ludicrous. Thus the British Museum catalogues *Memoirs of a flapper*. By one under "One". Even the reader who has just read the rule may be puzzled by this but on re-reading the rule he should see that this is the "correct" heading. The objection to such an entry is not only that it is based on such an abstract system that even those who have used the Museum catalogues daily for years do not immediately grasp its application but that it fails to meet the need of the reader who encounters the fully adequate textual reference "In the same year appeared the anonymous *Memoirs of a flapper*".

The object of treating a book as pseudonymous rather than anonymous is to bring together the works of one author. The ALA rule to make added entry under any phrase used instead of the author's name looks after the finding of a particular book. The reasonable course of action then would be to cease to worry about the difference between phrases which could or could not be considered as pseudonyms and enter as pseudonyms all words or phrases which become recognized as names. Naturally this will include all real names. In addition it will include words or phrases which become accepted as names as a result of constant use by the author. Such an approach might well involve re-cataloguing of books as a second work by the same author

appeared. "Sapper" is recognized as a name but not because it is a specific word. The Museum rule does in fact pick out the kind of words which are likely to be used as names but because the Museum code tries to express the rule in purely objective terms unrelated to the real criterion involved, produces such absurdities as the treatment of "one" as a pseudonym. If the acceptance of a word or phrase as a pseudonym brings together works by the same author it serves a purpose. If not it is useless.

The ALA rules deal very simply with anonymous books whose authors are unknown. These are entered under the title with references from any phrase expressing authorship. It is implied by the examples though not specifically stated that this means entry under the first word of the title not an article. The Glossary defines title entry as entry under the title "generally beginning with the first word not an article". Other codes provide more elaborate methods of treating title entries. The *Prussian Instructions* give very detailed rules but these are of little assistance to the English-using cataloguer as they are designed for a language which preserves a grammar based on inflexions. Their elaborateness and the difficulties which they lead to are well detailed in Löffler's *Einführung in die Katalogkunde*. The British Museum rules also provide an elaborate scheme of title entry. The heading is chosen from one of the following in order of precedence if they occur in the title: a name of a person who is the subject of the book; a collective body or institution which is the subject; a named object or place as a subject; a name of a person or place forming a necessary part of the title; the first substantive in the title; the first word not an article. This is a formidable list and the illustrations and amplifications increase its difficulties. Thus entry under person is extended from persons named to persons adequately described. *The recantation of the prelate of Canterbury* is entered under William Laud. The disadvantages of such an entry have already been discussed. It is a concealed subject entry and it is bad because it assembles only part of the material on this subject under the heading. It is also bad because it is an entry



which can only be of use to someone who knows the subject of the book. A student who found this work listed and undated in the stock of a late seventeenth century bookseller for example might not for a moment think that Laud was adequately described in this title. The same hankering after a subject entry is seen when a work on *Die Juden in Deutschland* is entered under "Jews" or *Troupes françaises* under France—Army. The choice even of subject entry is often puzzling to those who are not intimately acquainted with the application of these rules. *L'occupation de Templeuve par les Allemands* is entered under "Germans". The same attempt to produce a "natural" heading is found in the modification of the provision for entry under the first substantive. If this substantive is preceded by an adjective which gives the noun a special significance the whole must be taken as a Heading and this applies to any combination of words forming an unseparable expression. The indefinite character of these distinctions does not need stressing. Has "Ecclesiastical History" less of a special significance than "Holy Orders"? Is *Bedroom Furniture Designs* an inseparable expression? How many users will appreciate that *How will it end?* will be found under a very different heading from *What will the end be?*

It may seem a waste of time to submit the British Museum's rules to this much examination. No one would put them forward to-day as a model for the cataloguing of anonymous books. Even the Germans are abandoning the grammatical for the mechanical choice of entry word. The matter is not as simple as that. The compilers of the British Museum code were skilful and experienced librarians. The complexity of their rules for dealing with anonymous books spring from a fact of the utmost importance. The title of a book is not of the same value as the name of the author in identifying the book. The title of a book is frequently quoted inaccurately or incompletely. The Museum rules try to overcome this difficulty by selecting that part of the title which is most likely to be remembered. Their attempt to provide a satisfactory formula for selecting this part fails because

of the very care which is put into it. But this does not mean that the practice of entry under the first word of the title not an article does not have its own difficulties. Many titles are common to a large number of books and many titles are almost invariably shortened. The ALA rules do not (except in a footnote to rule 33) even refer specifically to those early books in which the title proper is introduced by a conventional phrase "Here begins" or by a string of non-essential adjectives. Titles of later books are frequently abbreviated. "*An inquiry into the nature and causes of the wealth of nations*" is generally shortened to the final phrase. It may be agreed that entry under the first word of the title not an article is the only method of title entry but this does not alter the fact that title entry is often little more than a last and only partially satisfactory resort. It will often provide the cataloguer with the easiest solution to a problem. It will less often discharge the essential function of the catalogue which is to relate the information possessed by the cataloguer to the other information generally available about the book.

The group of writings which the ALA code groups together as "anonymous classics" are of great interest because they introduce a new and important principle. They are defined as works of unknown or doubtful authorship, commonly designated by title, which may have appeared in the course of time in many editions, versions, and/or translations. The general rule is to enter these works under a uniform heading consisting of the traditional or conventional title. This conventional title is not the title of the book being catalogued. To enter an "anonymous classic" under the title of the book in which it appeared would be unsatisfactory as it would separate different versions of the same work. The conventional title may therefore be something outside the book which is supplied by the cataloguer. A marked New Testament which bears the distinctive and memorable title of "*The way of life and the way of death*" is not entered under the title but under the "conventional" title "New Testament".

The origin of these conventional titles is varied. Some are embodied in the first lines of the works themselves. Some have been sanctioned by long custom; others may be the creation of the modern editor who first published a text. Some conventional titles may be misleading and based on misunderstanding. The only characteristic shared by all conventional titles is that they are the generally accepted names by which a work is known. It is obvious therefore that a cataloguer cannot create a conventional title. The current usage of scholars must have done this for him. In some cases a work is so obscure and unimportant that it is difficult for the cataloguer to find evidence of an established title. In this case he has no choice but to use the form employed in the book he is cataloguing and hope that one form is employed consistently. There are excellent bibliographies of French, German and English mediaeval writings and the cataloguer can usually find guidance in these though unfortunately the compilers of these works are not always as interested as they might be in the exact form of names.

The ALA 33 which is long and involved enough to intimidate the boldest cataloguer suffers from a number of faults. It is not comprehensive enough and yet it includes too much. An Elizabethan play or an early Tudor interlude should be grouped with other early anonymous printed books which also may appear in different editions with slight variations of title or may be translated. An anonymous classic must exist in independence of any one printed version. Granted this essential condition a large variety of works falls under this heading. There is no need for special rules for the Bible or other religious works, for chronicles or for manuscripts. All these are alike in that they have no known authors but have a name by which they are known. The name may be a literary title or the name or merely the description of a manuscript—Exeter Book, Auchinleck MS., British Museum Add MSS. 1175.

Another weakness of the ALA rule is that it is not always clear whether it is concerned with author or title entry or with subject

entry. "Critical discussions of a cycle" or works by a known author dealing with the Arthurian legend should not be the concern of this rule. Above all the catalogue should not attempt to act as a potted literary history. This is what 33C (3) appears to attempt.

The catalogue entry offers no difficulty when a work possesses a universally accepted title—*Beowulf*, *Nibelungenlied*, *Chanson de Roland*—and a fairly well-defined text. It does not even matter if this title is so recent a creation that it is in a language quite distinct from the language of the work described—*The Seafarer*, *The Wanderer*, *The Ruin*. Difficulties arise when a fixed title has not been developed—"the Finn Fragment" "Finnsburg" "the Fight at Finnsburg". An even more difficult problem is posed by a collection such as *The Old English Riddles*. To treat this as a selection made by one man and enter under the compiler is to scatter what is essentially the same work. The selection is not really made by the editor but by the nature of the materials and different editions will contain almost identical texts. Ordinary title entry would scatter as much as entry under editor. The less of a "classic" a work is the more uncertainty may exist as to the wording of the conventional title to be used. An agreed reference book should give the answer and much time which is now spent in devising references and rules would be better employed in encouraging the creation of such books. In most major languages they already exist, although, as has been said, problems of titles are sometimes not given much attention. It should not be difficult to convince scholars in the arts that standardization of nomenclature is as important to them as to the scientist and must be attained in the same way. If this were done the cataloguer's problems would be largely solved. In the meantime he must seek as best he can for the consensus of informed opinion and perhaps aid the development of uniformity by ignoring little used forms of titles! Sometimes there may exist doubt as to whether a work is of such a character that it is likely to appear in different editions. The criterion is whether it possesses an intrinsic unity not

imposed by an editor. If it does entry under a conventional title is required.

It is difficult to lay down any one rule to govern the choice of language in which a conventional title should be given. In a learned library which contains original texts as well as translations it is probably better to use the language of the original text if this is clearly established. The real objection to rendering *Nibelungenlied* as *Song of the Niebelungs* and *Chanson de Roland* as *Song of Roland* is not primarily the odd effects of anomalous plurals and loss of the associations with *Chansons de geste*. It is rather that the original names are much better known even to those who have little direct acquaintance with mediaeval German or French. Where a translation has become accepted as part of the literature of the country the case is altered. There is no advantage in entering the Bible under a Hebrew or even a Greek title.

The discussion of anonymous classics has raised the second of the two questions which a cataloguer has to consider each time he catalogues a book. The first is "Who is the author of this book and if there is no author what is the proper substitute for an author heading?" The second is "What is the correct form of name to be used for the chosen heading?" It is possible to approach the first question much more systematically than the second. With forms of name the determining factor is always custom. There are few objective criteria which enable custom to be safely deduced from first principles, and custom is often extremely inconsistent. The task of the cataloguer is still to pick out and emphasize the underlying elements of consistency in current practice but when practice is chaotic the amount of consistency which can be achieved is limited.

The possibilities of choice with personal names fall into two groups. The first is concerned with what part of the name is to be taken as that by which the man is primarily known and under which he should be entered. The second and much larger group is of choice between different forms of name. The ALA rules give many instructions for the choice of part of name for entry.

The British Museum rules are more succinct and do not even bother to state that a modern European author should normally be entered under his surname. Nevertheless this is a practice which has not been universally accepted in Europe for much more than three hundred and fifty years and which is only gradually and incompletely spreading to non-European civilizations. The one rule which governs all cases of choice between different parts of name but which neither code provides is "Enter an author under the part of his name accepted in his own language and time as the constant and primary part of his name." In considering cases where common usage is uncertain more attention is to be given to the general practice in dealing with the class of names to which the particular name belongs than to any evidence of a balance of custom in the particular case". Such a rule begs no more questions than the present set of rules. It would need to be supplemented by information on accepted practice but this would be given as information and not as additional rules. The tendency has been rather to provide rules for groups chosen on grounds quite irrelevant to form of name. The reason for the choice of a group is that in general the groups chance to share a common type of name, but as the common type of name is fortuitous and not essential the rule has to be followed by exceptions which render it useless. Thus ALA rule 47 Saints gives the cataloguer no guidance. Some Saints are to be entered under the Latin form of forename, some under the vernacular forename, some under the surname, some under titles of nobility. There is nothing to reject in the decisions or the examples in this rule. It is, however, only a paraphrase of the statement "follow general custom". It also confuses two different questions—choice of part of name and choice of form of name. The most useful instruction which is provided in this section of the ALA rules is rule 58 Ancient Greek Writers and 60 Classical Latin Writers "In selecting the proper entry word follow the practice of the classical dictionaries". This advice is at least more easily followed than the rule for mediaeval writers which prescribes entry under

the forename for writers before 1400 except in those cases where entry under some other part of the name is more appropriate. It is unfortunate that the year 1400 is remembered by most English readers as the date of Chaucer's death but in fact no date can usefully be given after which surnames are in general use. The growth of surnames is a very complicated and haphazard process. Anyone who would lay down rules based on dates should consider St Ignatius of Loyola. It is true this might be considered an unsatisfactory example as Ignatius is a Saint. It is clear, however, that there is still considerable divergence of expert opinion on the treatment of Loyola. The *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (11th ed.) and the London Library enter under Loyola. ALA rule 47B includes him as one of those Saints canonized long after death (!) and known in history and literature by their surnames. The British Museum uses the heading Ignatius (Lopez de Recalde de Loyola) Saint. The *Catholic Encyclopaedia* enters under Ignatius Loyola, Saint and adds the puzzling statement "The name Lopez de Recalde is a copyist's blunder". It also gives the information that Ignatius was baptised Inigo a fact which the ALA example in its lavish prescription of cross references conveniently forgets.

At an earlier date the confusion can be even greater. The British Museum has a heading Gabrino di Rienzo (Niccolo). This is not a name which most readers would recognize. The *Encyclopaedia Britannica* states that Cola di Rienzo was the son of Lorenzo Gabrini. His own name was shortened to Cola and his father's to Renzo. Chevalier *Répertoire des sources historiques du moyen âge* adopts the variant Rienzi which all other authorities condemn as incorrect and enters under it. Of the authors he quotes only one uses the form Nicolas Gabrini. In this example it is possible to decide with some certainty that the weight of authority is in favour of entry under Cola. The *Enciclopedia Italiana* uses this form and the last edition of *Regole per la compilazione del catalogo alfabetico per autore nelle biblioteche Italiane* actually gives Cola di Rienzo as an example of a patronymic to

be entered under the first name. Nevertheless the British Museum and Chevalier are weighty authorities and the cataloguer who followed either could not be too severely criticized for scamping his work.

Any cataloguer could extend indefinitely a list of names on which authorities have failed to agree. In the light of this fact it is no abrogation of the cataloguer's responsibilities to suggest that it is not within his competence to decide whether a mediaeval writer is better entered under a forename or some form of surname. This is a task for the mediaevalist and all the cataloguer can do is to call attention to its importance. Failing one generally accepted authority the cataloguer can do no more than consult what authorities there are and compare their practice with what he knows of the usage of competent specialists. What is not only beyond his power but also actively harmful is to try to provide a cross-reference from every part of every possible form of name which may have been given to a mediaeval writer. This is to propagate chaos. The reader who finds no entry under Monmouth should be capable of having a second try under Geoffrey.

The problem which part of names to choose for an entry word is common to many languages and times. It is only with modern European names that the cataloguer can provide a specific cataloguing solution. Most English compound surnames are "naturally" thought of under the first part of the name. It is good cataloguing practice to enter them all under the second part. In so doing absolute consistency is obtained at the cost of a minor disturbance to accepted habit. It is easy for a reader to learn to look always under the second part which he has always recognized as a part of the name. ALA 38 would seem to accord better with the principle of following accepted practice and also to provide the reader with a more direct access to the author he is seeking. It suffers, however, from the defect of ambiguity. "In general" entry is to be under the first part of a compound surname, but exceptions are permitted and the cataloguer is



warned that he must distinguish between compound surnames and English names in which the middle name is a family name not forming part of the surname. Accepted practice does not make this distinction, e.g. Baring Gould is most frequently regarded as a compound surname. In addition holders of possibly compound surnames may vary the practice of hyphenation. In any case the last part of the name when used alone is always recognized as a possible form of the name but the first is not. Consistency can be secured without doing real violence to accepted practice. In other European languages it is the first part of the name which is constant and which can be used by itself, and so entry should be made under this part. Unfortunately practice is too chaotic for this practice to be made absolutely uniform. Married women often adopt unusual combinations which cannot be reduced to a simple formula. Brazilians usually compound the father's and mother's names but there appears to be no agreement as to which part is to be put first or which is the essential part of the name. Until Brazilians can put their own customs in order the cataloguer cannot do much more than follow the, often conflicting, practice of the biographical dictionaries. If, however, it could be agreed that the last part of a Brazilian name could be regarded as recognizable in itself as a possible form of the name then the cataloguer could help uniformity by entering always under this part. The cataloguer can only impose uniformity if his uniformity does not involve a violation of linguistic and social custom.

The treatment of names with prefixes illustrates this same point. In English and most European languages custom is clear cut enough for the existing cataloguing rules to be satisfactory. In English-speaking countries where a large proportion of the population comes from another country the position is more open. Mendelssohn in the introduction to his *South African bibliography* explains that no one in South Africa would dream of asking for Wet, Villiers or Toit but agrees that common usage favours Rothschild (de) or Mosenthal (de).

The solution would seem to be to follow the British Museum rule and treat these prefixes as part of the surname in the same way as if the writers were English. Admittedly there is some difficulty in applying such a procedure to a country which may soon cease to be even partially English speaking but the cataloguer cannot anticipate political events. A foreign writer with a name containing a prefix who moves to an English speaking country must be considered to have changed his name and should be entered according to the principles discussed in the next section. Where national custom is fixed and decided then the cataloguer is not justified in violating it for the sake of uniformity. The ALA and British Museum rules agree that Italian names where the prefix consists of or contains a prefix should be entered under the part following the prefix. The 1956 Italian rules reject this practice. Although it would be neater to treat all Romance languages in the same way decisions on forms of names cannot be dictated from outside. If Italian bibliographies, encyclopaedias and catalogues agree to enter D'Annunzio and not Annunzio there can be no case for flouting their agreed practice, particularly as the informed English reader would never himself think of looking under Annunzio.

In a very large number of cases an author is known by more than one name or form of name. The cataloguer can deal with these cases in either of two ways. He can seek to lay down a rule based on objective considerations or he can decide to use the form of name preferred by the author himself or by the majority of those who have written of him. Objective criteria for choice are clearly preferable if they do not result in a form of name which fails to correspond with the name employed in other sources of bibliographical information in which the book itself must be included. In almost all cases the attempt to provide foundations for choice in anything more permanent and objective than current practice breaks down.

The commonest and in some ways the most difficult case of authors possessing more than one form of name is where an

author chooses not to use some of his names or even prefers to use only the initial letters. The objective rule would be to enter all authors under their full form of name. It is a rule which would at times prove difficult to carry out, but sufficiently patient search could probably find the full names of most European authors. To what extent is a name derived from non-bibliographical sources of bibliographical value? Robert Burns spelt his names Burnes for the first thirty years of his life but few cataloguers have thought it necessary to make reference under this alternative spelling. British practice has been to omit forenames never used by an author and not indicated by initials. To include such names is to invite inconsistency as in many cases the cataloguer will have no practical means of discovering the full name. Almost all cataloguers do their best to substitute names for initials. The reason given is that the use of the full name prevents inconsistency. The author who has used initials in one book may prefer his full name in the next. The use of full names is also believed to be useful in preventing two different authors being confused. The real reason is almost certainly that the use of initials is felt to be a sign of scamped and careless work. The Library of Congress "no conflict" rule states that an author is to be entered under the form of name found in the book being catalogued unless this form conflicts with an established heading or is inadequate to distinguish the author. Whilst this is primarily an administrative device to ensure economies the mere fact that this device is possible is very significant. The substitution of full names for initials will not always prevent different authors being merged into one or the same author being divided into two. Indeed if the information giving the full names is of a completely non-bibliographical character the presence of full names may increase the possibility of confusion. For example J. Montgomery, M.A. (Glas.) may appear very appropriately on a school text book. The author is guilty of no inconsistency if he appears on the title page of his volume of poems as J. Montgomery. The cataloguer will spend very little time in connecting the J. Montgomery of the school

text book with James Wilson Carruthers Montgomery. It is highly improbable that there will be more than one author with this name whereas there are some well-known J. Montgomerys. The appearance of greater precision is however illusory because the full name does not correspond to any generally distributed bibliographical information. Even the most industrious cataloguer will never relate the author of the poems to the Glasgow graduate whose names he has displayed with such apparent efficiency. The reader who encounters a reference to J. Smith is faced with an appalling task if some ingenious cataloguer has unearthed the closely concealed secret that the J. stands for Jehoshaphat. It may be a British myth that some Americans possess an initial in place of a second name but the origin of the myth is easy to understand. Unfortunately there is one powerful objection to turning Library of Congress "no conflict" practice into a firm principle. It is fairly easy to discover the full names of all authors who proclaim themselves graduates of specific universities or members of professional associations. Most biographical reference works ask for full names and authors who appear in these works usually give their full names even if they do not in practice use all the names they give. Standard bibliographical practice tends to favour the use of the full names even if we remain doubtful of the working value of the practice. What cannot be challenged is the statement that the more effort needed to find a full name the less probability there is of the reward being worth the effort.

Most variant forms of name develop in chronological sequence. Noblemen, like authors who do not use their full name, enjoy two forms of name at the same time. A nobleman is usually referred to by his title. Does it not therefore follow from the principles so frequently reiterated that the cataloguer should enter noblemen under their title? It must be remembered that one of the principles put forward in dealing with names is that it is not always necessary to follow the most popular practice. Another method may be adopted provided it can be

applied with absolute consistency and is not linguistically or socially impossible. Everyone recognizes that a nobleman possesses a family name and in Britain at least every educated reader is familiar with the family names of most noble families. Indeed every user of every catalogue is forced in the end to discover the family name of the nobleman he is interested in. An entry Buckingham, Duke of, is impossible. The reader whose interest is in seventeenth century poetry must learn to distinguish between John Sheffield and George Villiers. It must also be remembered that one nobleman may inherit a number of titles. The Earl of Dorset was Lord Buckhurst when he wrote his best known poem. He was Charles Sackville throughout his life. It is for these reasons that most writers tend to couple the family names with the title and that the cataloguer can feel justified in making an entry under the most stable if not perhaps the best known part of the name.

Custom in France is so different that it is perfectly permissible to enter French noblemen whose titles differ from their family names, under the title. The number of such noblemen is much smaller than in England and the most stable element in their name is often the title. The user of the British Museum catalogue may be puzzled when an entry "Rouvroy (Louis de) Duke de Saint Simon Vermondois" is followed by Rouvroy de Saint-Simon (Claude Henri), Count see Saint-Simon (Claude Henri de) Count. His bewilderment as to why Rouvroy provides the main element in the name of the Duke but is omitted altogether in the form finally chosen as the appropriate heading for the Count is not lessened if he consults the catalogue of the Bibliothèque Nationale. Here he finds no entry under Rouvroy but he finds that the Bishop of Metz whom the British Museum enters as Saint-Simon (Claude de) appears as Saint-Simon (Claude de Rouvroy de) and that the other Duke whom the Museum enters under Saint-Simon (Henri Jean Victor de) Duke appears as Saint-Simon (Henri Jean Victor de Rouvroy M<sup>r</sup> puis, duc de). The deduction to be drawn from this rather confusing

comparison is that all the members of the different branches of the family combined the names Rouvroy and Saint-Simon but that Saint-Simon is the more stable and consistent element. In France titles appear to have become names—Buffon is used both within and without France as if it were a name and not a title. In French reference books entry is always made primarily and sometimes exclusively under title. The Dictionary of National Biography enters under personal names.

No code has suggested that ecclesiastical dignitaries should be entered under their titles although such titles are in fact as much used on their own as titles of nobility. Perhaps it is generally felt that the apocryphal bishop who signed a note to his dentist "Lucius, Upper Nile" deserved the reply he received. Both the Joint Code and the ALA rules prescribe a reference from the name of the see. As with entries under titles of nobility but to a much greater extent such added entries are of no value unless the searcher can identify the particular bishop he is seeking. He can only do this by knowing the personal name as the ALA rule examples do not even give the dates of tenure of the see in such references. In any case there are easier methods of identifying a Bishop of Chester than by examining every entry under Chester, A. B. etc. *Bp. of* in a library catalogue. The ALA rule 52C which prescribes references from all successive sees held by a bishop places an almost impossible burden on the cataloguer. How can he know whether the author of the pamphlet being catalogued attained his object, became a bishop, and never published even a sermon in his episcopal character! The elaborate distinctions the ALA code draws up between bishops whose titles are and are not to be included in a heading are as irrelevant as they are confusing. The Archbishop of Westminster is as likely to be known by his title as the Archbishop of Canterbury and why should a cataloguer care whether an archbishop has ruled a diocese? The object of these rules is to distinguish between bishops who are likely to be known by their title and those who are not. The method is to list examples of each class

chosen not openly on this basis but with some vague reference to ecclesiastical importance. In fact a suffragan bishop is as likely to be known by his title as any other bishop and a new see may at any time be created for him.

The Joint Code demands a reference from the see only in the case of bishops of the Church of England. Presumably this excludes bishops of the Episcopal Church of Scotland or the disestablished church in Wales. This is a curious and interesting example of muddled thinking. The English reader might be expected to know—or could reasonably hope to be told—the personal name of the Archbishop of Canterbury. He might have more difficulty in identifying the Bishop of Metz.

Although ecclesiastical dignitaries are commonly known by their title whilst they hold it their tenure of any particular title is often short and always uncertain. It is customary therefore for them to attach their own names to their books and their biographers will prefer the personal name to the confusion caused by the use of a title which will for much of the time necessarily be inappropriate.

Popes are ecclesiastical dignitaries but the name they assume on the election to the papacy is quite different from a bishop's title. It belongs to the large group of successive changes of name. Popes themselves offer no difficulties. It may be taken that any work by a pope emanates from him in his capacity as supreme pontiff of the Roman Church. It is quite distinct from anything he wrote before he became pope and it is desirable to enter the pre-papal works under his personal name and his official pronouncements under his papal name.

The ALA rules give instructions for many specific instances of change of name. These special rules are redundant. Married women, persons who have changed their names on entering religious orders or who have changed their names in order to assume an inheritance are from the cataloguer's point of view simply examples of change of name. The reason for the change is irrelevant. The principle which the cataloguer should use to

guide him is simply the principle which British law itself assumes. A name is what a man chose to be called by. He is free to change his name whenever he wishes to and although it may be convenient for him to accompany this change by certain legal formalities it is not essential. What is essential is that he should in practice be known by his chosen name. This principle does not imply that a writer who has had a variety of names will be entered under each of them. The cataloguer is concerned only with the names an author has used as author. He has no interest in a woman's maiden name if she has never published under this. He is not (ALA 46E) concerned with whether a woman is divorced. His only interest in a woman's being married is when she uses her husband's forenames and the title *Mrs*, *Mme*, etc. must be kept to distinguish her from her husband. If a woman uses her own forenames and her husband's surname then the addition of either *Mrs* or her maiden name in brackets is not merely irrelevant it is impertinent. The cataloguer will also waste a good deal of time searching for this irrelevant information which in many cases will be unobtainable. The catalogue is not concerned with names which a writer has never used in her works nor even with the origin of the names which she does use. If Mary Baker Eddy chooses to call herself Mary Baker Eddy the origin of each part of the chosen name does not matter. The justification for distinguishing between names according to whether they are maiden names, names of first husbands, etc., could be that such distinction is needed to avoid confusion which would otherwise arise. It is for those who propose these distinctions to produce examples to prove their necessity and this they have failed to do. It is true that there might have been several Mrs Humphry Wards but equally well there might be several Humphry Wards.

When a writer has published under more than one name the position is more complicated. The British Museum rules recognize that no special rules are needed for each example of change of name and state that "In the case of authors who change their name, or add to it a second after having published under



their original name, the Heading consists of the original names followed by the word "afterwards" and the name subsequently adopted". This rule has the merit of clarity and consistency and succeeds in assembling the works of one author under one heading. It has the great advantage of being independent of bibliographical information which may not be easily or always obtainable. A chance discovery may for example reveal that a woman who published all of her books under her married name had written one book under her maiden name. And does "published" include periodical articles? The alternative of entering under the latest form of name appearing on a title page is usually safer but it is not free from similar risks. A man who had entered a religious order might after years of silence issue a devotional work under his name in religion. It is also not a rule which can be applied to living authors.

The ALA rule 45 which prefers the later form of name lacks the simplicity and consistency of the British Museum rule as it permits an exception where an earlier form of name is decidedly better known. The exception is so important that the rule should be rewritten. "Enter under the name which is most generally employed. When doubt exists as to which name is most used prefer the later name." Despite the loss of consistency there can be no doubt that selection of the name most generally employed is the most useful practice. There is a great difference between consistency in the selection of the element under which a book is entered and consistency in method of selecting alternative forms of personal names. The user who realizes the principle on which a heading is selected can apply his knowledge to each book he encounters. The user will not usually be certain which was the first or last form of name an author employed. As he may legitimately not know that an author employed more than one name reference from all forms of name used by an author must in any case be made. If Mary Martha Sherwood is entered under Butt the user will probably be more impressed by the perversity than the consistency of the catalogue. Where difficulty may arise

is where several libraries contribute to a union catalogue. It is unlikely that any code of rules could ensure absolute uniformity. If a decision is made to prefer either the first or last form when reasonable doubt exists as to which is the most generally employed then inconsistencies arising from differences of judgement will certainly be no greater than those which could arise from differences in bibliographical knowledge.

Difficult cases certainly will arise but they will not be frequent. An established name is a literary asset, even a form of commercial goodwill. A writer who is well known or is becoming known is unlikely to change her name merely because she marries or gets divorced. It causes no surprise when a distinguished economic historian is always referred to by her maiden name even by her own husband. To a woman writer her name is much the same as the name of an actress or a singer, a public label unaffected by personal circumstances. This is one reason for preferring the latest form of name when in doubt, as a writer is less likely to change a name when well established. In some cases a writer publishes nothing during her lifetime. Then the choice of the first editor may be decisive. It would have been possible if not accurate to use the title "*The letters of Lady Temple*". A more involved case is where two forms of name are used on the same title page. *The Letters of John Ruskin to Kathleen Prynne*, edited by Kathleen Olander. Kathleen Olander is the married name of Kathleen Prynne but if, as seems probable, she has written nothing else, the name she has chosen as author can be preferred to the name chosen as editor. Posthumous publications can be considered as important as books issued by the author herself and Hester Thrale be preferred to Hester Piozzi. The introduction of Mrs Thrale provides an opportunity for the consideration of a hypothetical possibility. Even if her journals had not been published would not a reference under Thrale have been needed and would this not invalidate the statement that the catalogue is not concerned with names an author has never used? An author catalogue is not meant in any way to act as a biographical dictionary. A subject

catalogue or a dictionary catalogue must bring together works by an author and works about an author. A name catalogue is a partial subject catalogue. In practice therefore the rule may be modified to read "disregard names which are never used by the author as author or by others for the subject of a literary work".

A pseudonym is simply a special form of change of name. This is recognized in ALA 45. Once the distinction, already discussed, between an anonymous and a pseudonymous book has been settled pseudonyms offer no problems of their own. The cataloguer's choice is determined by usage and the probable extent of bibliographical knowledge. The Joint Code in a curiously negative rule permits entry under the pseudonym when the real name is not known. The ALA rule prescribes entry under the author's real name if known and then proceeds in familiar fashion to list exceptions. It is clear that not all pseudonyms are of the same character. At one end of the scale are those pseudonyms which are universally accepted as real names. The cataloguer in his ignorance must treat these as if they were real names. It is as impossible to count undiscovered pseudonyms as undiscovered murderers. They are said to be particularly common in Holland but exist in every literature. The sole advantage of being reminded of their existence is to destroy any perfectionist dream of always entering under the "real" name. Very near in character to undiscovered pseudonyms are suspected pseudonyms. These are particularly frequent among contemporary authors. It is not uncommon to find one reviewer referring to a name as a pseudonym and another making no mention of this possibility. Presumably the positive statement is to be regarded as based on knowledge but this is not always the case. There are many repetitions of the unfounded statement that D'Annunzio was a pseudonym. Further down the scale are those proved pseudonyms where the proof is not generally known. Then there are pseudonyms adopted by two authors for their joint work. Finally there are pseudonyms which are universally recognized as pseudonyms and where the real name is generally known but is

universally disregarded. Thus there are innumerable lives of George Sand and the standard edition of the personal letters of George Eliot appear not under any one of her "real" names but under her pseudonym. In all these classes entry should clearly be made under the assumed name.

Doubt will arise when an author has used both his own name and a pseudonym or even when an author has consistently written under a pseudonym but for various reasons is equally well known by his real name. Usually such an author is equally well known for his academic, social or political activities as for his literary work and a biographer may adopt either the "real" or the assumed name, e.g. Christopher North. Sometimes an author uses his own name and a variety of pseudonyms or adopts as a pseudonym a phrase or a word which could never be mistaken for a real word. In all these cases entry under the real name is to be preferred as the real name will tend to become better known as time goes on. It is, however, impossible to provide any schematic division of names which will predict the form under which each will be best known. Thus Colette in the books written by Colette Willy has been described as a forename. In the French *Who's Who* it is treated as a surname and the entry is Colette, Sidonie Gabrielle. What is certain is that any attempt to sum up in a heading all Colette's changes of "real" name is as useless as it is impertinent. Colette must be accepted as the appropriate heading and so must Stendhal though regrettably Stendhal neglected to provide himself with any forenames. When an author uses two names for two different types of work and preserves this distinction consistently it is possible to argue that both names should be used. The object of entry under one name is to bring together all the works of one author, but the reason for bringing all the works together is not biographical. It is to enable the works to be found. No one, it may be claimed, will want to find the mathematical works of a writer of children's books or the academic output of a writer of "thrillers". The argument is tempting and it must be accepted that in such cases entry

under one name conflicts head on with the function of locating a particular book or even a particular class of book. There is a case here for different libraries adopting different methods. A university library does not normally contain "thrillers" nor a popular library the more abstruse academic research. The large all-embracing library is still probably better guided to enter under the "real" name in the belief that in the course of time the real name will become the established name.

The suggestions put forward are unsatisfactory because they are open to a variety of interpretations dependent on the judgement and knowledge of the individual cataloguers. But in this they are no different from the ALA rules. Their only distinction is their admission that the only guide is common usage. Distinctions based upon "whether an author has ever published under the real name" or "whether an author wishes his real name withheld" attempt ineffectually to conceal this dependence. It is easy to show that common usage can be variously interpreted. The ALA rules permit entry under a pseudonym when this "has become fixed in literary history". The British Museum rules adopt much the same criterion but the first one enters Mark Twain under Clemens and the second under the pseudonym.

And yet it is custom which is the only guide even if it is at times an uncertain guide because names are a part of language and the correct use of language is determined by use—"... *usus, quem penes arbitrium est et jus et norma loquendi*". Throughout the discussion of forms of names the ALA rules constantly fall back on use. German, Swiss, Scandinavian and Russian married women can be entered under the compound name "when the compound name is known to be the preferred usage". The rules for pseudonyms conclude with the sentence "Other combinations of circumstance arise in which an individual case may require a special decision". This is a disheartening conclusion to a long series of specific rulings.

The alternative to commencing with an imposing array of objective rules to which it proves impossible to adhere is to begin

with an admission of dependence on custom and build on this dependence as much consistency as is possible. In some cases consistency will be based on an external authority. In others on a rule which though not present in the language is not at violence with the language. In the proposals outlined consistency is sometimes voluntarily surrendered. It would ensure consistency to enter all noblemen under their family names, all writers who have changed their name under the first form of the name, all married women under their maiden name, all known pseudonymous writers under their "real" names, all writers under the full form of their name. In fact lack of accessible bibliographical knowledge would impair much of this consistency. More important it would be a purely self-centred consistency. If the catalogue is only part of a larger framework of bibliographical references there is little virtue in its always employing the same method of determining the form of a name if the result bears no relation to the name by which a writer is universally known. In fact no cataloguing rules have attempted such consistency.

## CHAPTER THREE

### *Corporate Authorship*

THE principle of corporate authorship is in itself simple, straightforward and obvious. "Bodies of men are to be considered as authors of works published in their name or by their authority." These well-known words of Cutter's contain nothing new. It is not merely that provision for non-personal authors is to be found in Panizzi's 1841 rules. In a less well-defined form the principle is to be found employed in much earlier catalogues because corporate authorship is not an invention of the cataloguer's but is a concept which is natural to law, politics and common sense. German and some other European librarians have until very recently opposed the practice of corporate authorship but only because they have found the problems of its application too difficult. Their rejection is understandable because in fact the simple guiding thread of corporate authorship has too often led into a tortuous and baffling labyrinth in which cataloguer and catalogue user have perished ignominiously. Even in the best regulated catalogues it is the section devoted to corporate authors which draws to itself the most numerous and most intractable difficulties.

There are many reasons for this situation but the most important one to which all discussion of the problems of corporate entry constantly returns is the ineluctable fact that though corporate authors obviously exist their existence is far less settled and far less precisely determined than the existence of personal authors. The beginning and end of a corporate body may be equally ill-defined. Its name may be uncertain or it may use more than one name concurrently. When it does change its name the question may be open whether it has not also changed its

identity. It is not always easy to know whether a publication is in fact the work of a corporate body or only of an unofficial group of members. Cutter's "bodies of men" has a fine sweeping ring, but it is perhaps a little too sweeping. Works have been issued in the name of, if not exactly by the authority of, the people of England or the citizens of Glasgow but these are not author headings in the usual meaning of the term. Other bodies of men may issue proclamations or even burn down cities without ever possessing a name of their own. Personal author may present some of these difficulties but not so frequently or to the same extent. There may be no problems which are peculiar to corporate authorship but all the problems already encountered in the discussion of personal authors reappear exaggerated and distorted by the ill-defined character of so many corporate bodies. The catalogue is only part of a whole system of bibliographical references. It is one of the chief condemnations of existing rules for corporate entry that they are artificial in as much as they frequently depart radically from ordinary bibliographical practice and that they also lack sufficient inner consistency and self-evident logic to have had any influence outside cataloguing circles.

The multitude of rules in the present codes governing entry under corporate authors can be divided into rules answering one of two questions—either when to enter under a corporate author or what form of name to use. The conditions of authorship are the same for corporate as for individual authors. Authorship should imply both intellectual responsibility and a name permanently and intimately associated with a work but occasions arise when the second factor acts as a partial or complete substitute for the first. The most complete example of corporate authorship are administrative reports. These describe the functioning of a particular body and are the intellectual responsibility of the whole body. Even if drafted by one man the first draft will often have been amended by the committee which directs the affairs of the corporate body and the final report will be submitted to the



approval of the body as a whole. The report is always associated with the body and not with any individual author. To anyone brought up in the Anglo-American tradition it must seem perverse to enter such a report under any heading but the name of the corporate body. Once this firm point is left behind uncertainties accumulate gradually but inescapably. A regular report which presents factual information which it is the duty of the body to assemble is also clearly to be entered under the body. The subject matter is the responsibility of the body as a whole and the name of the man who chances to sign the report is of no importance.

Another group which tends to place itself overwhelmingly as the work of a corporate author but in which the element of doubt begins to appear contains reports on specific subjects whether these are the product of an *ad hoc* committee or of a group set up by a larger organization. Such works are in fact a special form of multiple joint authorship. Their distinctive feature is that they are issued "in the name of" the body, that is to say they are authorized expressions of a collective viewpoint. As a result it is the name of the body which will be most closely associated with the work. In many cases of course the names of the collaborators are not given and even if they are named it is always possible for the corporate body to employ a different group of persons to provide a second edition or a continuation. Usually no special prominence is given to any one collaborator. One complicating factor is that corporate bodies often set up committees to report on a particular issue and then take pains to make it clear that the resulting report is not an official expression of the views of the corporate body. Thus the Historical Association's Teaching of History Leaflet No. 17 is described as the work of a sub-committee of the Association. "The sub-committee has held a number of meetings ... and all its members have contributed to the ideas and suggestions contained in the following pages. But it is not in any sense an agreed statement of policy. ..." As is well known the reports of the Study Groups of the Royal

Institute of International Affairs never represent the official policy of the Institute.

It is here that the principle of intellectual responsibility can be reinforced by that of a name "permanently and intimately associated with the work". Where there is no individual author a work will be more closely associated with the body which is responsible for it even if it does not incorporate the official views of that body. We are on more uncertain grounds in claiming that although it is true that each Chatham House Study Group is made up of a different group of individuals yet all the groups share sufficient characteristics to enable an entry under this heading to serve the function of bringing together works by the same author.

Some cataloguers have called attention to the apparent inconsistency that works *presented* to a corporate body will be entered under that body as author. For example it would be normal to regard the Council of Europe as the author of *The development of Africa. Report of the Group of Experts presented to the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe*. The "author" it may be said is the Group of Experts but closer examination reveals the fact which is implied if not established by the title page that the Group of Experts was appointed and its terms of reference laid down by the Assembly. An analogous situation exists whenever an entry is made under the body to whom a work is presented. If a work is presented to another body by a completely independent group then entry would be made under the group but in cases such as the one illustrated there is no need to introduce confusion by following an abstract logic beyond the point at which it loses utility.

The most common relationship between a corporate body and a work is that of "sponsorship". This is an ill-defined term which covers a large variety of relationships but all implying a degree of responsibility which falls short of authorship. A society or government department which issues a work by an individual is not committed to the views expressed in that work though it

certainly gives the report sponsorship as worthy of consideration. In the past cataloguing practice has varied according to whether the writer of such a work was a member of the staff of the body issuing the work. The real issue is whether the work is an official pronouncement issued "in name and by authority of" the corporate body. If it is not then entry should be under the writer of the report and in recent years the general tendency has been to so enter. It has become increasingly difficult as well as irrelevant to decide whether a work is issued as part of a man's official duties. A government department or society may commission a man to compile a book on a particular subject. Many histories of firms are entrusted to well-known authors but others are the work of full-time members of the firm. The cataloguer may sometimes have no means of knowing the exact position and cannot base a decision on knowledge he does not possess. The enormous increase in the number and scope of corporate bodies together with the complexity and variety of their relationships to the individuals they employ and subsidize makes the old distinction increasingly difficult to apply. Consistency and convenience both favour entry under the individual author. Some difficulties attend this decision. It must be admitted that it is not always easy to be certain when a work represents the official voice of an organization. If a body has commissioned a work then it has the power to issue a second edition by a different author but this is something which can equally well occur with works which have no connection with a corporate body. A work may be issued by many members of the staff of an organization, or a collection of works by different members of the organization may be issued as a single volume. Entry under the organization will cause some confusion to an inattentive reader. If works are issued as a part of a regular series then an added series entry will be made for all works by an individual author. If a work is part of a regularly appearing sequence then the body responsible for the whole sequence will obviously take precedence over the author of an individual number. The reports of the Inspectors

of Mines give the names of the official who is the author of each particular annual report but it is the body responsible for the reports as a whole which is the author. In the same way a corporate body may plan a work in several volumes and is therefore the author of the work even though individual volumes may have individual authors. But when these exceptions have been allowed for preference for entry under the personal author remains a satisfactory guiding principle.

It must be admitted that sponsorship by a corporate body is often very hard to distinguish from publication. Both imply a judgement that the work is worthy of publication and, although this judgement is presumably more worthy of consideration when made by a scientific body than by a commercial publisher, a university press is in this respect undistinguishable from a scientific body. Some cataloguers have made added entries for all works published by a corporate body. The ultimate illustration of the absurdity of this is provided by Osborn who points out that in Russia and Spain the same work may be published in two editions, one by the state cultural organization and the other by an ordinary publisher. If one edition is received it will be entered under the publisher, if the other it will not. Statements such as "issued under the auspices of" or "supported by a grant from" do not necessitate a catalogue entry. It appears to be necessary for any publication which is assisted by United States government funds to carry on the title page the name of the official body through whom the funds are transmitted. Such statements can be ignored as can also the long lists of supporting organizations which decorate some title pages.

Even when an organization has done more than assist in publication and has actually organized the meeting the record of which is being issued does it necessarily imply that the organization is to be treated as the author? Is such organization not one of the functions of a publisher? A commercial publisher will often suggest the theme of a book and invite specific authors to contribute to it. The test is whether the name of the body

is permanently and intimately associated with the work. There are two cases where this will certainly be the case. The one is when the work is one of a series all organized by the same body. The other is when it is a record of the meeting of a single organization or of a meeting which is given a definite name of its own. When an organization arranges a meeting which is not confined to its own members it is very doubtful whether its name will be particularly closely associated with the work. This is illustrated by the fact that statements of sponsorship do not always appear on the title page but may be relegated to the end of the preface. It is quite clear that the body which has its name prominently displayed on the title page has often had less to do with a work than its more modest counterpart. The interpretation of title page statements is itself often a matter of difficulty. "Rheumatic diseases. Based on the proceedings of the seventh International Congress on Rheumatic Diseases. Prepared by the committee on publications of the American Rheumatic Association, Charles H. Slocumb, Chairman." Presumably "based on" means that these are the proceedings of the Congress. *Proceedings of the Kammerlingh Onnes Conference on low temperature physics at Leiden on 23-28 June 1958 under the auspices of the International Union of Pure and Applied Physics organized by the Nederlandse Natuurkundige Vereniging with the support of Netherlands industry.* Who is to evaluate "under the auspices of" and "organized by"? *Gas chromatography 1958. Proceedings of the Second Symposium organized by the Gas Chromatography Discussion Group under the auspices of the Hydrocarbon Research Group of the Institute of Petroleum and the Royal Chemical Society of the Netherlands.*

Symposia of this kind form an ever increasing proportion of scientific literature and it is hardly an exaggeration to claim that each example which appears provides some fresh relationship with its sponsor. The function of the catalogue can be no more than to enable a particular work of this type to be found. It is the task of the catalogue to bring together all works by one author but the concept of "sponsorship" is too vague to make it

possible for the catalogue to attempt to bring together all works which a corporate body has sponsored. Works of this kind are really a special form of periodical. Although a single issue periodical is a contradiction the analogy is helpful. The practice of scientific writers is generally to quote them by title and although many titles are non-distinctive there is a growing tendency to select a title which incorporates in the first words the subject of the discussion. Many catalogues enter such works under the editors. The disadvantage of this is that most often the function of the editor of such a symposium is confined to preparation for the press. The original selection of contributors and subjects has not been his so his name is not likely to be particularly closely associated with the work. Added entries will of course be made under the editors—if there are not more than three—and conservatively under corporate bodies when there is a good reason to believe that the work will be sought under their names.

These remarks, as has been said, apply only to general symposia for which some corporate body is loosely responsible. They do not apply to reports of actual meetings of a single organization or to the proceedings of meetings with a definite name—*The microbiology of fish and meat-curing brines: proceedings of the Second International Symposium on food microbiology.*—*The cotton industry in a world economy: official report on the International Cotton Conference held at Venice.*

Often a corporate body will organize a series of lectures on a particular theme and the lectures will afterwards be published perhaps under a different title. Unless there is some very clear indication that these lectures represent an official statement of the organizing body this must be regarded as a purely publishing activity and entry be made either under editor or title as appropriate.

There must inevitably be many difficulties in deciding the relation of a corporate body to a work. The title page is often dictated by the needs and stresses of the organization and may in consequence often be deliberately vague. It would even be

possible to quote examples of works which have run into two editions in which one edition appears as a statement of official policy and the other conveys a specific warning that the material is only put forward as worthy of consideration! Difficulties will however, be reduced if the general principle that mere publishing activity does not justify an entry is adhered to as closely as possible.

To act as an author a corporate body must not merely be intellectually responsible for a work it must possess a name. It is part of the ambiguity which confuses all problems of corporate authorship that corporate bodies can exist without possessing names and that it is often difficult to distinguish between a name and a description. Indeed in many cases it is only the repetition of a description which turns it into a name. Thus the cataloguer who is presented with *What makes an executive? Report of a round table on executive potential and performance* (New York 1955) will be justified in deciding that "a round table on executive potential and performance" is not a name of a corporate body. As, however, there are no accepted conventions which prescribe what descriptions may or may not be accepted as corporate names it would be quite possible for such a phrase to be used as a name and if a number of reports were issued by this body then it would be quite appropriate to use it as an author heading.

Examination of the Foreword shows that there the phrase is used as a name "the—not the title page 'a'—Round Table on Executive Performance and Potential" and the Foreword states "The Round Table quickly developed a group identity. At the final meeting it agreed to suspend its activities rather than to dissolve. As the Graduate School of Business continues its researches ... it expects to call on this distinguished group for further assistance." Does then this distinguished group possess the characteristics which entitle it to be considered a corporate author? To act as an author a corporate body must have a defined, even if fugitive existence, and an accepted name. The body which produced *Is unemployment inevitable?* lacked both of

these characteristics and so cannot be accepted as a corporate author even though it continued in existence long enough to produce a sequel.

It may be possible to construct a definite and indisputable name and yet this name will not be useful because it is not in fact an accepted name. *Maternity in Great Britain: a survey of social and economic aspects of pregnancy ... undertaken by a joint committee of the Royal College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists and the Population Investigation Committee.* To enter this work under Royal College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists and The Population Investigation Committee, *Joint Committee* would be possible but would it serve either to bring together the works of one author or to introduce the name most permanently and intimately associated with the work? In many instances the questions raised by an example of corporate authorship cannot be solved solely from the information provided by the work being catalogued. *Soil physical conditions and plant growth. Compiled by the Joint Committee on Soil Tilth, American Society of Agronomy, American Society of Agricultural Engineers.* "Joint Committee on Soil Tilth" may well serve all the purposes of an author entry. It depends on whether it has become recognized as an issuing body.

This is a problem which will be discussed again in connection with the other problems of form of name. There is another class of "nameless" bodies for which the existing rules make special provision. These are meetings of bodies or classes of citizens (ALA 140, 141). It is at once obvious that these are not in any usual sense of the term author entries. An entry such as Albany, Citizens, does not bring together all the works of one corporate body. It may in fact be used for two different and indeed opposing bodies. It may be that Albany, Citizens, is the most memorable part of the title of the work being catalogued but Albany, Citizens, is not an author entry but a catchword from an anonymous title of the same character as those employed by the British Museum. The arguments already employed against the British Museum do not need to be repeated. It is anomalous to



use this method for one type of anonymous book and not for all. And in any case it is not clear how this type of work is to be defined. If a public protest by people living in Geneva and Lausanne against happenings in Bulgaria is to be entered under Geneva. Citizens, what is to be done with the various *ad hoc* protest meetings held in London which it would seem absurd to place under London. Citizens, when they may have been attended by no more than a score of supporters all drawn from outside London. The case against "classes of citizens" is even stronger. Here the cataloguer is not merely asked to ascribe to a meeting a title which it may not merit and may never have adopted. The sub-title itself is often such as the catalogue user might never look for. London. Women; Geneva.—American residents. The gentle-women and tradesmen's wives "in and about the City of London" did not call themselves the women of London and from what ALA 141 quotes of the second title it is very hard to understand the sub-heading "American residents". If any group were responsible for this celebration it would surely be the United States citizens resident in Geneva.

In all the examples of corporate authorship so far considered there has been an element of intellectual responsibility but this is not always present. Sometimes the only justification for entry under a corporate body is that the name of the body is the name most permanently and intimately associated with the work. It is a universal practice to enter catalogues under the name of the library or in the case of the private collection under the name of the collector. Obviously a library is not the author of its catalogue in the same sense that it is the author of its annual report and catalogues of private collections are often not made until the collector is dead. In the past they were most usually made when the collection was offered for sale. ALA 13C appears to assume that library catalogues are entered under the name of the personal or institutional owner because these have authorized their appearance. This argument is unsound because a library catalogue is not in the same category as an official pronouncement of cor-

porate policy. It is much closer to a piece of scientific work which a corporate body has asked an individual to carry out. In any case ALA rules prescribe for entry under the owner of sale catalogues which the owner cannot be considered in all cases to have authorized. In addition there are many instances of early catalogues which bear in themselves no indication whether or not they are authorized publications. It is impossible to make the correct cataloguing of such works dependent upon knowledge which the cataloguer is normally not in a position to obtain and which may no longer exist. The reason for entering catalogues of libraries, art galleries, etc., even when compiled by a single author, under the name of the owner of the collection, whether a person or a corporate body is not because the owner has authorized the work but because this name is the name most permanently associated with the catalogue. It is always probable that subsequent catalogues compiled by different individuals will appear. It is partly for this reason that the individual cataloguer rarely receives any acknowledgement of his labours. It is a rare user who knows that a library catalogue bears a compiler's name.

The distinction between authorized and unauthorized catalogues though not valid in itself has a certain basis in reality. A list of the incunabula of a single author to be found in one library such as quoted in ALA 13C is certainly not to be entered under the name of the library. The real distinction is between catalogues and privately compiled bibliographies based on the holdings of one library. Any work which describes itself as a catalogue of all or of an objectively defined major part of a library's holdings should be entered under the library. A work such as *Twelve books in fine bindings from the library of J. W. Hely Hutchinson described and discussed by Howard M. Nixon* is clearly not a catalogue. Sometimes the decision is less easy. *The book of British topography. A classified catalogue of the topographical works in the library of the British Museum relating to Great Britain and Ireland. By John P. Anderson (of the Library, British Museum),*

does, with some diffidence, describe itself as a catalogue. Reluctance to enter it under the British Museum springs from the feeling that to do so would give it the technical authority which a British Museum catalogue possesses, but is this an adequate basis for treating the catalogue as if it were not, in fact, a catalogue of a reasonably substantial portion of the Museum library? There would be much less reluctance to treat this book as a catalogue if it did not relate to a library whose official catalogues are treated with such reverence. A catalogue of the works of a single author is not closely associated with the name of the library itself. A catalogue which covers works in a particular category in several libraries or galleries will clearly be entered under the compilers or its title.

The importance of library catalogues is that they introduce a number of catalogue entries which have been grouped together as "non-author headings", a term which has aroused some fierce controversy. The first thing to be remarked about these non-author headings is that they obviously exist. A title-entry is "a non-author heading": a conventional title provides a non-author heading under which different editions of the same text can be assembled and which does not need to correspond to any title appearing in a book being catalogued. The real problem is to what extent the concept of "non-author headings" can be useful in removing certain difficulties met with in cataloguing works by corporate authors. A good deal of rather complicated and abstract controversy has broken out. It must be accepted that entry under author or title is always desirable. An alternative heading is certainly to be employed when it is the only means of bringing together different editions of the same work which would otherwise be scattered under different headings. It must be seriously considered when the "correct" author heading is very unlikely to be known to the user of the catalogue.

All existing codes use "non-author headings" but not all in the same instances or for the same purposes. In many cases these headings can be regarded as an extension of a conventional title.

This is a reasonable interpretation of ALA 85 which prescribes the entry of constitutions under the name of the country followed by *Constitution*. It could be argued that a constitution is not an anonymous work but has as its author the Constitutional Convention which produced it. This is in fact not always the legal situation and even when it is the constitution remains capable of change by various processes and may in the course of time bear little resemblance to the original draft. Sometimes as with the present constitution of France there is no one body which can be treated as author. The constitutions of many of the former British Dominions have been originally based on an Act of the British Parliament which may have suffered many changes. This is an instance where general practice now tends to suppress reference to the "correct" author. It may therefore be felt that such a heading as United States Constitution even if it is not theoretically very neat does fulfil the essential function of the catalogue more adequately than any other method which has been suggested.

ALA 84 which prescribes entry of Laws, Statutes under the name of the country followed by this form sub-heading is even less capable of theoretical defence. In Great Britain at least it is a matter of law and of a common habit of thought that laws are made by parliament and by-laws by the town council. It is sophistry to suggest that an entry such as Great Britain. *Laws* can be interpreted as analogous to the omission of a non-essential step in an administrative hierarchy. The overwhelming argument in favour of adopting this method of entry is that in countries with a more varied constitutional history the "author" of its law may change from time to time. As the Joint Code remarks "Attempts to arrange all legislative enactments of a country under the legislative body or the ruling power, the names of which are in some countries subject to frequent changes, are likely to prove perplexing and unsatisfactory". When a country has passed from a state of dependence on another power to self government the case for this form heading is even stronger. It

removes the need for elaborate cross-references and in any case it will not be a matter of general or easily ascertainable knowledge whether the laws of a particular dependent country at a particular time were laid down by the suzerain power or promulgated by some officer of its own. It is clear, however, that in both these instances the concept of the "name permanently and intimately associated" has completely ousted that of intellectual responsibility. It is also clear that in the extremely intricate complexities of legal and constitutional relationships which may change constantly it is not always possible to apply concepts of responsibility which may apply quite clearly to individuals.

But to admit that a principle will not always hold is not to agree to overthrow it at the slightest pretext. ALA 87 states that charters are to be entered under the body owning the charter. This is perhaps convenient. We more often wish to know whether a body possesses a charter than what charter a particular authority has granted. But can convenience be erected into an excuse for a reversal of normal practice, for entry under recipient not author? A charter carries in itself the name of the authority granting it. Convenience can be equally well served and the general pattern of author entry maintained by reversing the rule and entering under the grantor with added entry under recipient. In both main and added entry the sub-heading "charters" is needed not merely as a filing device but to define the heading.

Treaties between two countries have natural author-headings. International treaties, agreements, etc. can be treated like the publications of other international bodies. If part of a sequence they will be entered under the name of the regular organizing body. If single meetings called together by no one authority then title entry is indicated. If a treaty issues from a conference which also has a name then the name of the treaty will still be given preference as the main entry. Harvard University Library enters censuses under the Country followed by the form heading "census". This is justified by the reasoning which has already been used to justify the accepted treatment of "constitutions". In

different countries different departments at different times are responsible for compiling the census. There is, however, an important difference. It is often impossible to provide a satisfactory author heading for a constitution. There is always some department responsible for the census. An entry such as China. *Census* is attractive and may certainly save the user and the cataloguer much time. No one, however, who is intimately acquainted with nineteenth century catalogues can fail to have noticed the facility with which such "useful" headings lead down to confusion. The interests of the cataloguer and the catalogue user are best served by holding as firm as possible to fixed principles. Special forms of heading must be restricted to works for which they provide an overwhelmingly superior form of entry.

Other examples of non-author headings in the present ALA code are the entry of ships' logs under the name of the ship and of criminal trials under the name of the defendant. A ship's log is a work which clearly lacks an author—the captain can hardly be regarded as such as the log is continued unbroken when captains change—and which may appear in many different editions. Entry under the name of the ship can be regarded as a form of conventional title which serves the essential purpose of preventing the scattering of different editions under different titles. The author of a criminal case can be considered to be the government of the country. Even in a small country such as Scotland a form sub-heading such as "criminal trials" would obviously be needed and a further subdivision either by the name of the defendant or the date. In countries with a Federal Constitution there would be the added difficulty that some trials are initiated by the state and some by the Federal Government. A further complication is that, although the government may be responsible for initiating the original trial, it is the defendant who is the author of any appeal. Entry of a criminal trial under the name of the defendant can surely be accepted as a conventional title which saves many difficulties.

The same argument can be put forward to cover many cases

of local records—parish registers, records of lay subsidies, replies to episcopal visitations, wills preserved in specific archives. The criterion must be that what is being catalogued has a definite and objectively defined content which will be the same in any edition and that it lacks any author. A selection of wills relating to a specific group, e.g. booksellers, selected by an editor is quite distinct from the complete body of wills preserved in one consistory court. A parish register has no author but equally clearly it cannot be entered under the editor or under the first word of the title. It is claimed by some that a library catalogue is entered under the library because it is an "authorized" or "official" publication. The types of publication considered are also all "official". The report of a trial is quite different from the account of a trial written by an author who does not confine himself to the official record.

No real difficulty arises if it is recognized that "non-author headings" or "form headings" are not a new principle which provides an easy solution to all difficulties, or the basis of a new approach to cataloguing theory. They are simply part of an old and well tried method of approaching certain specific difficulties which should never be used where an ordinary author or title entry is possible. It is true that such headings are, or can be, a disguised form of subject entry as can be illustrated from the British Museum catalogue and even more strikingly from some other nineteenth century British library catalogues. But provided the headings are not used as an easy substitute for a possible orthodox author entry they can give easier access to individual works without impairing the integrity of the catalogue. The author catalogue in any case contains many non-author entries—names are used as titles as well as authors. In some cases a work can be supplied with no adequate author or even title entry and an entry based ultimately on an analysis of the content of the work catalogued can be accepted. The essential task is to restrict and define the occasions on which such entries can be made.

There are two sources of the many difficulties which the

cataloguer encounters in selecting the appropriate form of name for a corporate body. The one is that the names of corporate bodies are not always fixed and determined. The other is that the same name may be shared by many different bodies. This second difficulty applies of course also to personal authors but to a much more restricted degree. It is an essential characteristic of corporate bodies and the attempt to overcome the confusions it may give rise to has caused much of the complexity of the present cataloguing codes. In general cataloguers have tried to find a solution by classifying the different bodies into groups according to their administrative character and function and providing specific rules for each group. It is now commonly agreed that this effort has failed. For many years the distinction between societies and institutions has been attacked as inconsistently developed and bibliographically irrelevant. The ALA code attempted to remove confusion by a more consistent analysis and a more thorough provision of specific rules. The result was not encouraging. As has been pointed out there are fourteen rules forming exceptions to the basic rule 92 for institutions. Some rules are exceptions to exceptions. One rule is an exception to an exception to an exception. The final destruction of the old approach was Lubetzky's careful and convincing demonstration that what Cutter and those who elaborated the distinction between societies and institutions were really seeking was an external method of distinguishing between those names which were in fact distinctive and those which were not. It is now agreed that no external criteria are available and that the cataloguer is forced back on the name itself.

A distinctive name is a name which unambiguously denotes one particular body. No name of a corporate author can be completely distinctive. It is always conceivable that another body may share the same name just as it is possible that another individual may share the same name as a personal author. In practice, however, it is not difficult to decide whether a name used by itself is adequate to distinguish a corporate body. Names which are



made up from personal or geographical elements are usually distinctive. There is no probability of there being two John Rylands Libraries or London Institutions. Even in these cases the cataloguer must act with judgement and knowledge. Bray and Carnegie are names which do not distinguish individual libraries. Most names of societies are distinctive, even though it is never possible to exclude the possibility of duplication. Once names containing personal elements have been left it is not possible to draw a certain line between names which are probably distinctive and those which are possibly not. Names such as Institut d'études démographiques, Indian Science Institute, Friends of the National Libraries, all fall into the comprehensive class of "possibly distinctive names". In contrast to this class are those bodies which possess a name which is obviously common to many of them. High School, Public Library, Art Gallery, are clearly not distinctive names in themselves. It is possible to argue that even these names if given in full would be distinctive. They would then run Glasgow High School, Edinburgh Public Libraries, etc. This argument immediately runs foul of the other great source of confusion which is the frequent lack of fixed forms of corporate names. It is impossible to be certain without special investigation and it may remain uncertain even after such investigation whether the full name of such bodies does incorporate the place name or whether the place name is merely added by custom for convenience. There is a clear distinction between these names and such a name as Edinburgh Bibliographical Society in which Edinburgh is an integral part of the name.

There is no difficulty in dealing with the large class of possibly distinctive names. All such bodies are most commonly referred to by their name and should be entered under their names. In cases where it is necessary to distinguish between two bodies with the same name the name of either the town or the country should be added in parentheses after the name. The choice between town and country will be determined by which the body is more closely associated with. Should the cataloguer wish to add an

identifying place name in all cases there would be no objection in principle but it would be an unnecessary expenditure of labour.

Those bodies whose names can be made distinctive only by the addition of a place name could be treated in the same way as those with possibly distinctive names. It would be possible to write Public Library (Edinburgh) Art Gallery (Glasgow). It would be inconvenient to do so as the number of entries under these headings would be very large and it would be the subsidiary part of the heading by which a particular body would be sought and identified. It would also be unsatisfactory as in practice the place name is almost always added to the name even if it does not form part of the official name. Entries such as Edinburgh Public Libraries or Leeds Art Gallery are not in reality entries under place. In names such as these the place forms part of the name. In very few instances it may not form an official part of the name but only be added by general custom. In many more it may be added in a more extended form than a single place name, e.g. County Borough of West Ham. But there is a clear distinction between this type of entry and such an entry as Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University. What we are dealing with is a standard arrangement of names which are made distinctive only by the addition of a place name. If in these cases it is the accepted convention that the place name is put first then the difficulty of distinguishing between a distinctive and non-distinctive name becomes greatly decreased. It is true that we are still faced with the need to distinguish between names in which the place name is added for the purpose of distinction and those in which it is prefixed. "Grammar School" is clearly a name shared by many hundreds of institutions so there is no hesitation in choosing the form Manchester Grammar School. "King Edward VI Grammar School" is also a title not confined to a very restricted number of schools. It cannot, however, be claimed that Birmingham King Edward VI Grammar School is a rearrangement of the different parts of a name so the entry King Edward VI

Grammar School (Birmingham) is indicated. The same criterion would govern the different treatment of Botanical Gardens and Royal Botanical Gardens. One difficulty of the proposed solution is that it depends upon the ability to use a place name either as a noun or an adjective and that the ability is almost confined to English. The same official publication can use both London University and University of London but this form of variant cannot occur with a French university. This obstacle can be overcome by a suitable typographical device. The result can still be regarded as an inverted form of heading not as an entry under place. More complications arise when the place name is not the name of a town.

These complications arise in part from the fact that there can be special adjectival form of the name of countries and where these forms exist it is contrary to normal practice to use an inverted form of name. It is impossible to use Wales University as an alternative form of the name University of Wales. It is nearly as uncommon to use the form New Zealand University. The cataloguer can still adopt the inverted form Wales, University of. His justification for so doing is the need for uniformity. Not uniformity in entering similar institutions—only the British Museum rules at present provide the same treatment for all names of universities—but uniformity in treatment of the same type of name. The names University of Western Australia and Leeds University are alike in that the distinctive element in both is supplied by a place name. They differ in that the University of Leeds is known equally well by either arrangement of its name. The difference is not caused by Leeds being the name of a town. Natal University is in the same class as Leeds. The distinction is whether the place name can be used as an adjective. It would be possible to base a rule on this distinction and for such a rule to be satisfactory for the needs of cataloguers. It is however, too subtle a distinction ever to be deduced by a user from the example of the catalogue and would therefore have the disadvantage of appearing capricious. There would also be a

certain number of names in which there would be some difficulty in reaching a unanimous decision as to whether or not a place name could be used as an adjective. A simple solution would be always to adopt the direct form. It can be claimed that the existence of an official form of name incorporating the place name puts such a name as "University of Edinburgh" in a different class from "Public Library of Edinburgh". The form "University of" although not often the only form seems to be the form preferred in official reference books. The aggregation of entries under "University" need be no more confusing than the aggregation of entries under "Journal" and can be dealt with in the same way. A distinction between names which are made distinctive only by the addition of a place name and names which contain a place name as an essential part of their formal title is defensible. It need not be said that if there is only one form of the name and one which cannot be inverted it must be followed as it is. The Australian National University is as much a distinctive name as Johns Hopkins University.

The reasons which have been suggested in favour of entering such names as those which have just been discussed under the direct form apply with even greater force to such names as National Library, National Gallery. These names are incomplete without the addition of a place name but the fact that the number of such bodies is very limited makes the direct approach much easier. The full official name is completely specific—National Library of Canada, National Library of Wales. Foreign institutions of this character usually possess names which are even more distinctive. There cannot be many libraries with the name *Bibliothèque Nationale*.

Entry under the direct form of the name of a national institution necessitates the user knowing the correct form of name. A conventionalized heading such as "Poland, National Library" would often be much easier to use. The objection to such a "natural heading" is that it is the invention of the cataloguer's. It would not always be easy to know what phrases should be

rendered in this way and what of "national libraries" which bore the names of individuals? The catalogue should contain all necessary references but is not a substitute for a reference book.

An alternative to the inverted form "Scotland, National Library of" is the form Scotland, National Library, in which Scotland can be regarded not as a place but as the author. It is common practice to regard a country as the author of those works which appear in its name and which are in fact mostly issued by its government. In recent times the scope of governments has increased enormously and as a natural result the cataloguer has tended to restrict the class of government publications as much as possible. ALA 72 states that certain institutions and other bodies erected and maintained by governments but not direct agencies of governments are to be treated according to the rules governing these bodies. A long list of bodies is given which includes libraries, colleges, observatories, prisons etc. This ruling is clearly necessary. Presumably if all bodies in Russia which are created and maintained by the state were to be entered under Russia this heading would include all the institutions of the U.S.S.R. In a short time the position in the U.S.A. will not be very different. The term "not direct agencies of governments" is perhaps not very clear. What seems to be meant is "not executive departments of governments". Even this phrase is not free from ambiguity. It clearly excludes the Medical Research Council but does it include the Public Record Office?

National institutions such as National Libraries or National Galleries are not executive departments of government. It could be argued that the grounds for entry under the country is that they are bodies supported largely by public funds, receiving official sanction and containing in their name an indication that they serve the whole country. Such criteria would make it necessary to enter the British Museum under Great Britain which even the Joint Code does not require. The insertion of an exception for bodies with distinctive names would still preserve an administrative basis of division. The catalogue heading could not be de-

duced from the name of the title and could often only be discovered by careful searching. Few British cataloguers or readers would know that the National Cancer Institute is supported by the United States Government but that the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis is not. Fewer still outside Great Britain, and not so many within, could define accurately the status of the National Register of Archives or the National Coal Board. In any case the status of such bodies is liable to change. Ought the catalogue entry for the National Trust to be changed if the kind of recognition given to it in recent budget provisions were to be greatly extended. Convenience and consistency are both served if entry under the country as author is restricted to executive government departments. "National institutions" whatever their sources of support are best entered under their own names.

The distinction between bodies created and maintained by governments and the executive departments of governments is one which is universally recognized. A government is intellectually responsible for a statement made by its Ministry of Agriculture. It is not so responsible for the statements made by a research laboratory which that ministry may have established. A ministry is commonly regarded as a specialized expression of government opinion. A "Foreign Office statement" and a "British Government statement" can be treated as identical terms. Some government departments may appear to possess distinctive names—Home Office, State Department, whilst others are common to many countries—Department of Agriculture etc. Since all government departments are merely departments the possession of an apparently distinctive name is not important. The name State Department is always used as a shortened form of "the American State Department", and as has been said the name of a department is often regarded as synonymous with the name of the government. Reference will often take such a form as "an official paper giving the Russian views on nuclear inspection". It will be extremely difficult to trace this paper amidst the great

aggregation of entries under Russia but a preliminary guide to departmental subdivisions can direct attention to likely headings. Anyone wishing to trace this reference will be forced to look under "Russia" even though the great aggregation of entries under this heading will present many difficulties.

Government publications do not differ in any essential characteristics from the publications of any other corporate body. The great difficulties they present to those who seek to record or to trace them is occasioned primarily by the vast output. Some assistance is gained by restricting entry under a country in the way which has been suggested to those publications which represent the official pronouncements of executive departments of government, but even when this is done governments remain such prolific authors that some libraries construct special finding lists for government publications or even fall back on the unsatisfactory device of making use of the official publication lists. One constant source of confusion is the tendency which government departments possess to an exceptional degree to proliferate subdivisions. This is a quality which they share with other corporate bodies and the trouble it occasions will be discussed later. An equal impediment to satisfactory cataloguing is the inconsistent and often inaccurate manner in which reference is made to government papers. Even if a heading has been constructed on a consistent and satisfactory pattern from a skilful evaluation of the information on the title page it will not help the reader who is presented with a reference which prefers a subsidiary or even extraneous approach. Those who quote government papers and still more those who quote them in the body of their text follow no uniform procedure. Reference may be made to the name of the issuing department but it is equally likely that the title or even some "popular" title based on the subject will be preferred. The name of the chairman of a committee has grown in popularity as a means of description since Sir William Beveridge presented his own purely personal report. Government publications are of great topical interest and references to them will therefore often

be collected from newspapers but the cataloguer cannot base his headings on a guess as to whether journalists will refer to the report of a tribunal by the name of the presiding judge or the subject whose conduct is being investigated. He will make as many added entries as can be constructed on a consistent pattern but he will never succeed in always keeping abreast of popular nomenclature. One reason for the general lack of consistency in citing government publications is that the author statement is often concealed or confused by irrelevant matter. This matter includes references to the authority by which a paper has been prepared or names of related departments. What in non-governmental publications would be regarded as a statement of joint-authorship is often no more than an indication that some department has an interest in the paper. All documents which apply both to Scotland and England carry the name of the appropriate Scottish department even though prepared and issued solely by the English department. Thus the paper *Clinical research in relation to the National Health Service* conceals its author statement in the confusing list of departments—Medical Research Council/Ministry of Health/Department of Health for Scotland/followed in italic by Central Health Services Council/Advisory Committee on Medical Research in Scotland. The preface makes it clear that the Scottish contribution to this report was limited to examining the proposals and approving them, subject to certain unstated modifications. The very modest report on *Overseas information services* (1959) is shown to be the responsibility of six different departments. Other examples could be produced without difficulty of documents for which no one department is clearly responsible. In these cases there is no name of an immediate issuing body permanently and intimately associated with the work. Entry should therefore be under the title but for the reasons already indicated this is best subordinated to the name of the country. There are some cataloguers who would prefer the title to the name of a department whenever the existence of a subdivision may cause uncertainty as to the name which will



be most closely associated with a publication and others who would restrict the use of departmental subdivisions to regular administrative reports. The fact that the Stationery Office now supplements its departmental lists with some subject lists is perhaps an indication that departmental subdivisions may be losing the significance they once had. The standard bibliographies of parliamentary papers adopt a subject division. It could be argued that this is a filing device similar to the arrangement under one author of collected works, individual works, etc. Certainly one of the catalogues of government publications which offers the greatest ease and certainty in use adopts the method of division by subject and further arrangement by date. The dangers of this approach have already been discussed and can be illustrated from the columns of the British Museum catalogue. The analogy between such a filing device as "Collected" and "Land Drainage" is forced. What can perhaps be admitted is that when a library has an extensive collection of government papers there may well be a case for creating a separate subject catalogue and not attempting an author entry. The mixture of author and subject arrangement must give rise to confusion.

It has already been shown that the name of a corporate body may vary. How then should the form employed as a heading be established? Is it possible to treat a corporate body as a personal author should be treated and enter under the form of name found on the title page of the book being catalogued unless it conflicts with a form of name already established in the catalogue. This is clearly desirable since corporate authors, like personal authors, should be entered under the form of name they prefer and by which they will be best known. Some authorities (Taube, New York Public Library, Department of Scientific and Industrial Research), claim to follow this principle. Many difficulties, however, arise. Some corporate bodies are reckless in their varieties of form of name. Thus most British Government papers, unless intended primarily for an international public, do not include any statement of country of origin, and use different titles for the

same office, apparently quite at random. On three different papers, from the same department it is possible to find Secretary of State for Home Affairs, Home Office, Secretary of State for the Home Department. With foreign government publications questions of international politics intrude. The cataloguer, as well as the politician, has to decide whether he is to recognize the *Deutsche Demokratische Republik*. The *Deutsche Bibliographie* prefers to employ *Deutschland Sowjetzone*. The British cataloguer is more likely to consider his function to be purely that of recording but he has still to decide whether to preserve the unifying entry Germany and whether to translate the names employed by the two governments or to use the terms common in this country. The perplexities involved in recording clearly and impartially the publications of Chiang Kai-Shek's government are even more obvious. When the name a government assumes differs from that generally accorded it then a simple following of the title page offers no way of escape.

Corporate bodies differ from individuals in that in many—though not all—cases they possess official sources for their names which are published and can therefore be consulted more easily than a birth certificate of an individual. Up till recently a large body of American cataloguing opinion held that the correct form of name of a corporate body was its full legal name. Such a principle would appear to remove all ambiguities. It is, however, open to the following difficulties. Charters of incorporation are not free from ambiguities. Thus the Royal Society is described in its 1662 charter as the Royal Society, in the charter which confirms and enlarges its privileges in the following year it is the Royal Society of London. The Royal Medical Society of Edinburgh possesses a royal charter but it is doubtful whether the charter confers the epithet "Royal" on the Society. In many cases the legal name is in Latin and difficulties of translation may arise. The 1681 Charter of the Royal College of Physicians of Edinburgh is headed "*Charta erectionis regii medicorum collegii apud Edinburgum*"—The 1685 charter of ratification which is in

English, refers simply to the "Royal College of Physicians"—in the text *Societas* is usually, but not always, joined to *Collegium*. In practice the College always used the order *Collegium Regii Medicorum*. In addition the translation of "apud" caused considerable legal argument in the mid nineteenth century. Examples can be found in which a modern society gives two different forms of its name in the same volume. A legally established name, even if not ambiguous, is of little use if it differs materially from the name in general use. This is recognized by ALA 94. ALA 92B draws attention to the variant titles used to describe French municipal libraries, and suggests that the title *Bibliothèque municipale* should be used in accordance with the practice of the *Annuaire des bibliothèques et des archives*. It then proceeds to qualify this sound advice by providing that libraries which possess distinctive individual names should be entered under the town and name, Aix. *Bibliothèque Méjanes* and more confusing still that important libraries "which have issued publications tending to make another form distinctive for the library in question" should be so entered—Lyon. *Bibliothèque de la ville*. ALA 93B—adjectives or abbreviations denoting royal privilege—really discusses further this problem of "official" and "customary" names. The apparent arbitrary rules arise from an attempt to find classes in which the full name is needed and others in which it is not. The cataloguer or user of the catalogue who does not appreciate this unconscious but very justifiable motive, is naturally puzzled to learn that he must enter *Kongelige Danske videnskabernes selskab* under *Danske* but *Koninklijke Bibliotheek* under *Koninklijke*. He will also be relieved to realize that the favour given to papal over imperial titles has not in fact anything to do with Guelf or Ghibelline, or even the power of the Roman hierarchy in the U.S.A. Many of the difficulties in ALA and Cutter spring from the desire to provide natural headings. It is assumed that it is "natural" to look for British institutions under Royal, but not to look for foreign institutions under Kaiserlich or Königlich. Such assumptions may have some weight in them,

but they cannot be made the basis of consistent practice. If a body regularly uses the form *Kaiserlich* then it should be entered under this. If, however, it can be shown that normal practice as demonstrated in its own usage and standard reference books is to ignore this part of the name, e.g. to disregard it in filing then it should be ignored by the cataloguer. It can happen that a body consistently displays a name on its publications but is not generally known by this name. Many German universities bear the names of royal founders or former patrons. References to them in British and indeed in most German writings will be by the place name. Most English writers will refer to Freiburg and not to Albert-Ludwigs-Universität. The only answer would appear to be to follow the practice of the international reference works making references from the form not used. In dealing with corporate bodies the cataloguer is constantly reminded that absolute consistency is unobtainable. Names are matters of social habit. It is an established if unfortunate fact that American universities with distinctive names are never referred to by the name of the town in which they are situated but that German universities most frequently are. It would serve no purpose to make an entry under New Haven because an entry has been made under Freiburg. The most wholesome course for the cataloguer is to admit his own powerlessness. The way to destruction is to try to conceal it by distinctions based upon apparently objective but bibliographically irrelevant distinctions. The same illusion of a "natural heading" should be avoided in dealing with names beginning with a personal name, Dr. Williams Library, Sir John Cass Institute. It might be natural for most readers to look for the second under Cass—an uncommon name—and for the first under Dr. as they would expect many entries under Williams and not knowing this Williams's first name, would wish to avoid wading through the lot. The proper answer is to treat all names of corporate bodies in the same way as titles of anonymous books and enter under the first word not an article.

The object is clearly to enter a corporate body under the name

by which it is generally known. It is not possible always to establish this from the title page of the work being catalogued and recourse should therefore be had to reference books both in order to identify the body and to find its established form of name. Taube states that different cataloguers using different reference books often arrive at different forms of name. Sometimes this is no doubt the case. On the other hand, modern institutions will usually have been responsible for the entry describing themselves in standard reference book, and may perhaps take more care over the name there than in all their publications. Dead societies will usually have obtained some degree of name stability in standard reference works. Logically it might seem that once authorities outside the book being catalogued have been consulted there could be no stop until the name had been traced back to the charter, etc. This is not even logically the case as we are seeking to discover general practice, not legal correctness. Errors are bound to occur. Their number and their importance can be made negligible by the cataloguer being constantly on the lookout for the possibility that an apparently new society is already entered in the catalogue under a variant form of name. The catalogue is the reference tool to be studied with the most care.

Lubetzky who, in a survey of 90 corporate headings in the Library of Congress, discovered 56 bodies with two or more forms of name—one with seven!—admits that in many instances the two forms of name have been identified as belonging to one corporate body by means of information in only one publication. There is therefore little chance of the cataloguer in the smaller library always escaping from error.

Some variant forms of name consist simply of shortenings. The Library Association of Great Britain appears to have given up using the last part of its title. The Royal Society describes itself on some publications as the Royal Society and on others as the Royal Society of London. In both these examples there are obvious advantages in using the more extended form which may in some cases be needed as an alternative to the addition of a

place name in parentheses to distinguish the body from another bearing the same name.

Changes in name are distinguished from variant forms of name by the fact that the two forms are not used at the same time but successively. Often the change is the result of a formal decision by the corporate body and can be attributed to a specific date. When this is not the case the distinction can be blurred. It is possible for two names to be used as alternatives over a period and for one name ultimately replace the other. An illustration is the dropping of "for the improvement of natural knowledge" from the title of the Royal Society.

Changes of corporate names can be treated in the same way as personal names and entry be made under either the first or last or best known form of name. On the other hand it can be claimed that corporate bodies are not the exact counterparts of individuals. An individual who changes his name is still unquestionably the same individual. A corporate body which changes its name may sometimes also change its character to such an extent as to raise the question whether it continues to be the same body. Indeed if corporate bodies were more controlled by rational considerations than they are the only reason for a change of name would be a substantial change in the character of the corporate body. Societies and institutions often prolong their lives over a much longer period than any individual. Few people are interested in the publications of a body for the light they throw on the whole corporate activities of the body. If a society possessed one name in the eighteenth century and now flourishes with rather different interests and a quite different name it is arguable that entry under one name will not really serve every one's best interests. The student of the eighteenth century will look under the name best known to him and which he will encounter in his reading and be relieved not to have to wade through many entries which have no interest for him. The modern student will share the same satisfaction. Only the reader interested in the history of the society will have to look under

more than one heading. Not all changes of name are straightforward. Amalgamations and absorptions are common. If one name is selected as a heading the cataloguer will sometimes have a very difficult task in deciding whether a new society has come into being or an older society changed its name at the same time as it absorbed its rival—a problem which can be greatly complicated by the numbering of publications. A further disadvantage of entry under one form of heading is the elaborate additions to the body of the entry which have sometimes to be made to avoid giving a wrong picture of the title page. If entry is made under each different form of name with annotations linking each form to the one immediately preceding and following there is no need to make radical alterations to existing headings if earlier or later publications bearing a different form of name are added to the library.

There are many objections to this style of entry. It is at times desirable to trace all the publications of a body which has changed its name and it can be a time consuming and frustrating process to assemble this information from a succession of different headings. On the theoretical level the use of each form of name as it appears is the equivalent of entering the different works of a single author under the form of name given on each title page. This last argument is by no means as strong as it seems. Study of corporate headings constantly strengthens the realization that the object of bringing together all the works of one author is often only partially capable of realization and must always be subordinated to the task of tracing the particular work. The cataloguer is often faced with the selection of the lesser evil and the experience of libraries which have for very many years followed the practice of treating each form of name of a corporate body as a separate heading suggests that this practice carries with it fewer disadvantages than any alternative. If it is felt that one form must be preferred then the choice must be the latest form. Corporate bodies do not change their names so very frequently as a rule and the earlier form is bound to become gradu-

ally forgotten. The reader who is directed to the British Institute of International Affairs is naturally inclined to resentment. The choice of "best known form of name" is made almost impossible by the long life of corporate bodies. The question must be "best known to whom?" The natural assumption is that the latest form is the one best known to current users. There are some institutions where the cataloguer may suspect that a change of name is only a prelude to extinction but he cannot give expression to his suspicions however well-founded. If a body has ceased to exist then in a few restricted cases it may be possible to decide on a best known form of name. Thus the Preussische Geologische Dienst kept this name for almost the whole of its existence then in the last ten years of its life indulged in almost as many changes of name.

It is tempting to try to distinguish between minor and substantial changes of name and to decide to select one form in the minor changes. Mere abbreviations can certainly be treated as minor changes particularly when there is no one date at which the change definitely occurs. Beyond this the suggestion although inviting is delusive. It may be claimed that when a University College is raised to the rank of a University it is pedantic nonsense to preserve the old heading and introduce a new one. The institution itself is unquestionably the same. Its publications continue in unaltered sequence. By general practice the higher title is extended retrospectively. A history of the University of Nottingham will not be restricted to the few years in which the University itself has existed. These are all good points but it is necessary to distinguish between two different reasonings which they can be used to support. The one is that as a University College and a University are so unquestionably the same body that they should be entered under the same heading. Obviously this argument could not be restricted to this example. Equally clearly the cataloguer cannot be asked to pick those changes of name which are associated with obvious continuity of function. The example of a University College becoming a University is



therefore only an example of one of the many cases in which entry under the latest form of name possesses most advantages. Even in this case entry under the latest form has certain disadvantages and the confused antecedents of many University Colleges present their own problems. The other line of argument is that the two different forms of name themselves proclaim continuity. Here again fuller examination shows that the recognition of continuity of name depends upon special knowledge. To a foreign or even an American reader the relationship between a University and a University College is not self-evident. The addition of "Royal" to a name is another example where divided entry appears inappropriate. Even after the addition of "Royal" the unadorned name will often be used in referring to the body if not on its own publications. But in fact two names of societies one with and one without the "Royal" adjective can represent two quite different bodies. In the actual experience of cataloguing work of corporate bodies, some of which are well known to the cataloguer and others quite unknown, any attempt, except the simplest, to distinguish between minor and substantial changes of name breaks down.

Corporate bodies have a property which is not shared by individual authors and one which causes the cataloguer and the catalogue user much vexation; they are capable of developing subordinate bodies which can also act as authors. The existence of these subordinate bodies has already been referred to in the discussion of government publications, but they extend into almost all branches of corporate authorship. Most corporate publications are the work of a section of a corporate body. Is the cataloguer to ignore these subdivisions, to use their names as sub-headings or to enter them as corporate authors in their own right? This is a problem which has perplexed cataloguers for over a century. Cutter refers to "departments which do not have an independent existence" and also to professional schools which have a distinctive name. He added to these distinctions based on administration and nomenclature others based on topography.

The ALA rules continue to provide many answers. Rule 75 provides for bureaus and offices which do not "have a distinctive name so that one of the same name might exist in another department". Rule 100 enters affiliated societies under their own names without reference from the larger organization with which they are affiliated. Rule 101 on the other hand, with a few exceptions, enters societies related to, but not an integral part of, a larger organization under the larger organization. Rule 102 enters institutions forming an integral part of a larger organization under the larger institution and provides exceptions for observatories and some professional schools of Universities especially, reintroducing Cutter's topography, if situated at a distance from the University. Rule 106 introduces a further complication by decreeing that agricultural experimental stations of the United States, even if forming a department of a University, are to be entered under the state or territory in which they are organized.

Before attempting to extract some order from this tangle an attempt can be made to find guidance on the use of the names of subordinate bodies as sub-headings. There are instances where it is clearly impossible to use the name of a subordinate body as a main heading but should it always be added as a sub-heading? It is obvious that the use of a sub-heading is primarily a filing device. Its object is to enable a particular work to be found more easily. If it is not needed then there is no point in adding it purely in order to define the corporate author more precisely. It is hard to believe that such headings as these quoted in ALA 126 are ever likely to be really necessary—Savannah. Independent Presbyterian Church. *Flower Committee*, Providence. First Baptist Church. *Sunday School. Library*, whilst Wayne, Neb. Methodist Episcopal Church. Members and Friends, is clearly absurd. There is no need to add *Library Committee* to the heading for a library report although in fact the Library Committee will usually be credited with responsibility for the report. A satisfactory general rule would be to use sub-headings only when these provide a distinct

and precise extension of the main heading and when the sub-heading can be used to assemble a number of works. An exception to this last provision would be when the main heading was used for an extremely large number of entries, e.g. the name of a country and the body which gave its name to the sub-heading had a distinct existence, e.g. a Royal Commission. The entire publications of some corporate bodies consist of the reports of *ad hoc* committees. To use the often ill-defined titles of these fugitive committees as sub-headings and have no entries under the main heading serves no useful purpose. There are some librarians who question the value of subdivisions even when these represent well-defined subordinate bodies responsible for many publications. Contrary to expectations it is some of the larger libraries who have supported this view. Thus Harvard entered all the publications of the American Library Association under the Association itself and ignored all divisions, and claimed that this improved the efficiency of the catalogue. The very existence of this claim proves that sub-headings are not indispensable and yet few cataloguers would feel inclined to follow the Harvard practice. The informed reader's interests are to be preferred to those of the uninformed. With a body such as the Library Association—and presumably also the American Library Association—the informed reader is always aware of the subordinate body. Not only will the subordinate body be kept in mind when seeking a particular book but if the reader wishes to know whether the American Library Association has issued anything on a particular subject he will turn to the appropriate division of the association. Such arguments would leave little room for discussion if it were not that the subdivisions of corporate bodies are not fixed and that even the allocation of responsibilities may be ill defined. Every cataloguer will have noticed that the ALA rules are "Prepared by the Division of Cataloging and Classification of the American Library Association" and that the preliminary edition was prepared by the "American Library Association—Catalog Code Revision Committee".

On balance the use of sub-headings for subordinate divisions is probably justified if care is taken to see that their use is confined to cases where the divisions are reasonably permanent and functionally well defined. It is never possible to draw an absolute line between independence and subordination. A Group of a Section of the Library Association does not submit what it proposes to publish to the censorship of the superior ranks in the hierarchy and may, within ill-defined limits, express and publish opinions completely opposed to official Library Association policy.

This observation brings the argument back to the question of the conditions under which the names of subordinate bodies can be adopted as headings. The criterion of independent existence is both vague and bibliographically irrelevant. It often cannot be deduced from a study of the work being catalogued or even from the generally accessible reference books. Different cataloguers and even different administrators may arrive at different conclusions. Even if these disagreements could be found to be based on misunderstandings the undesirable fact remains that the administrative position of a body may be altered whilst its name and function remains unaltered. To alter a catalogue entry on the basis of information which is concealed from all but a few administrators and those who take special pains to unearth it is clearly absurd. The exact administrative relations of even government bodies are often regarded as essentially private affairs. The cataloguer who inquires even of his own university whether or not a body is to be regarded as attached to the university will often meet with a stony answer. The most characteristic feature of modern corporate organization is its extreme and constantly increasing complexity. One subordinate body may depend upon several superiors for different purposes. It is not possible to follow ALA rule 102 and enter institutions forming an integral part of a larger organization under the larger organization because the cataloguer will be in no position to know when such a state of affairs exists. Often the status of a particular body will be the

subject of academic power politics into which the cataloguer would be foolish to intrude. A university of the character of the University of London illustrates this complexity at every turn. The older teaching hospitals were teaching institutions long before the University existed and may still have research, and even teaching, responsibilities independent of the University. The surprisingly named British Postgraduate Medical Federation is apparently the body responsible for the organization of postgraduate medical studies in the University of London. Some of its publications contain no reference to the University and the relationship could never be suspected from the ill-chosen and arrogant title. The Institutes which are attached to or perhaps make up the Federation are also administratively dependent on other bodies. The Institute of Basic Medical Sciences is a teaching department of the Royal College of Surgeons of England, The Institute of Cancer Research appears to be simply the teaching aspect of a hospital. In some cases the hospital whose postgraduate teaching activities form the "Institute" seems to have no other relationship with the University. The probabilities which strew the preceding sentences reveal the difficulty the outsider has in attempting to unravel this kind of relationship. Another aspect of the same difficulty is provided by bodies such as the Warburg Institute which are now attached to the University but which first acquired a name and reputation as independent bodies. Amongst commercial organizations it is not uncommon for the parts to preserve an independent name when they have lost an independent existence. Sometimes the organization publicizes the relationship, e.g. Unilever. More often it keeps it as secret as the commercial law permits.

It is for these reasons that there has been a movement which has sprung up independently in many different libraries to show a general preference for using as often as possible the name of a subordinate body as a heading. ALA rule 75 is on these lines when it recommends entry of government departments directly under the name of the country except when they possess a name

which may be common to several departments or where they are names of divisional units. In this case, though the ALA rule does not make this actual point, the name is only fully comprehensible in conjunction with the larger departments. Many cataloguers have tried to extend the principle which this rule applies to government departments to all forms of corporate bodies and have taken as their rule "enter under the name of the body immediately responsible as long as this body possesses a name which is fully intelligible when standing alone". The conditional clause would not be taken to exclude names which require the geographical addition to make them fully distinctive. University College, London and University College, Oxford, would be acceptable headings.

Up to a point the proposed rule has great advantages. It disposes of the ALA distinction between professional schools and constituent colleges. Barnard College and Balliol College will both be entered under their own names. Some confusion is caused to some readers because similar institutions are treated in different ways. Cambridge—University Library, Bodleian Library. Inconsistencies of this character are inseparable from all purely bibliographical approaches to corporate names and the user can be taught to understand them. It may be remarked that Cutter approved of using Bodleian as a heading.

Uncertainty develops as always with the border line cases. Taube disposes of uncertainty by decree. He argues that no principle can be evolved which all cataloguers will always interpret in the same way. The solution is therefore to draw up a list of subdivisions which cannot be accepted as headings and to enter everything else under the specific agency responsible. The exact contents of the list is not of first importance, because in many cases the decision must be arbitrary. Taube's proposals were developed for a specialized collection of scientific reports. It is easy to show the difficulty of constructing an arbitrary list of names unsuitable for headings which would be used in a general catalogue and it is better to fall back on the principle already

expounded. Admittedly each cataloguer will not give a uniform interpretation of "a name which is fully intelligible when standing alone" but then complete uniformity in the treatment of corporate authors is ruled out by the complex, changing and only partially revealed, character of corporate bodies themselves. A uniformity based on administrative relationships could not be attained and when obtained would in many cases result in puzzling and apparently "unnatural" headings. Administrative relationships certainly influence the interpretation of names but unfortunately similar administrative relationships do not always lead to the same use of names. Consider the colleges of the Universities of London, St Andrews, Aberdeen and Wales, and the "universities" of the University of New Zealand. There are some administrative relationships which might appear always to influence forms of a name. A university department is usually but, as the ALA rules recognize, not always sought under the name of the university. It is not possible to construct a rule "Enter university departments except those of astronomy, agriculture and marine biology, whether or not they possess distinctive names, under the name of the university". What is true is that it is not uncommon for university departments to possess names which are in fact not generally used or not exclusively used. Many libraries are named after some benefactor but the distinctive name though exhibited does not gain general acceptance. It is possible to modify our rule and to enter under the larger institution subsidiary bodies possessing distinctive names whenever these names are consistently used along with the name of the larger body in such a way that the precise name is unlikely to be used in isolation or whenever the more precise name is in practice often replaced by a name purely indicating relationship.

It is easy to show that purely administrative criteria cannot form the basis of the rules for the selection of those subordinate bodies whose names are suitable for adoption as headings. Purely linguistic considerations are also inadequate guides. The old concept of "independent existence" is a snare when interpreted

legalistically but like all our cataloguing errors is based on a glimpse of truth. A body—such as a sub-committee—which proclaims its lack of independence is unlikely to establish itself as an author. In the same way if there is a choice between a committee which exists for one purpose only and a larger body to which this body is predominantly subordinate then the larger body is more likely to be established as the author. When this choice does not exist the name of a committee which expires after a single parturition can be useful as a heading. "Joint Committees" might appear to fall into the same class as sub-committee but in fact they usually do not. A name such as "National Joint Advisory Committee" can exist in splendid independence with no indication of the possible significance of "Joint". Difficulties of this kind appear frequently in government papers and the organization of government papers is so chaotic and illogical that the most determined cataloguer becomes faint hearted. With other forms of corporate bodies a consistent and convenient heading is more easily attained.



*The Subject Catalogue*

MUCH less attention has been given to the subject catalogue than to the author catalogue in professional literature and far less success has been obtained in drawing up authoritative and detailed rules. In English the accepted guide is still the fourth edition of Cutter's *Rules for a dictionary catalog* (1904) and these have been only partially developed in the fourth chapter of the Vatican Library's *Norme per il catalogo degli stampati* (1931). The reasons for this comparative neglect are to be found not in the lesser importance of the subject catalogue but in the intractability of the difficulties it presents. It is possible to have the idea of a perfect author catalogue, consistent throughout, in which every heading is the indisputably "correct" result either of logical deduction or of agreed convention. An author catalogue which is both completely intellectually satisfying and practically convenient has certainly not yet been created but it is at least possible to criticize the rules for author and title entry with such a catalogue in view. In mere internal consistency many author catalogues have already reached a high level. To detect an "error" in the catalogue of the British Museum is an occasion of surprise and guilty pleasure. With the subject catalogue the position is quite different. The subject catalogue can be judged only by the criterion of convenience and the best that can be attained is a number of approximately satisfactory entries.

There are many reasons for this. The concept of the subject of a book is not easy. One author is normally quite distinct from another author, and one title from another title. Very rarely as in the case of some mediaeval romances it may be difficult to distinguish between a variant text and a distinct romance. In

subject cataloguing this difficulty is always present. No subject exists as a completely separate entity. All subjects contain other subjects and are parts of larger subjects. The life of Queen Elizabeth is part of the history of England and *The courtships of Queen Elizabeth* is part of the history of Elizabeth. It is also part of the history of France and Spain. All books deal with several subjects and the only way to bring these subjects to the attention of the reader who might need information on one of them would be to reproduce an "ideal" index of each book. Many books deal with several subjects or with the relations of several subjects. Indeed the excuse for writing a book is often a claim to have discovered a hitherto unsuspected relationship between different subjects. Cutter admits that a subject heading cannot be supplied unless there is a generally accepted name for the subject. It is possible to go further than this and state that a subject is not really accessible to treatment in any form unless it has been accepted as a recognized object of investigation.

If an author has succeeded in drawing attention to some hitherto completely neglected aspect of a larger subject it follows axiomatically that an adequate subject entry for his book cannot be made. To succeed in doing so would prove that the ideas the author was putting forward had already been defined and recognized. Not all books which contain original material and treatment deal with new subjects but those which do largely escape the subject cataloguer who is always limited by the incomplete knowledge of the users of the catalogue. D. P. Walker's *Spiritual and demoniac magic from Ficino to Campanella* deals with a well-defined subject but "Spiritual magic" is a term which would completely mislead almost all who have not read the book.

The subject of a book may be overlaid by questions of interest and approach. *English pulpit oratory in the seventeenth century* deals with preaching and yet, as the term "pulpit oratory" suggests, it is the sermon as literature which is primarily being considered. Often it is not possible to do more with a book than indicate the broad subject with which it deals or even the class of writing

to which it belongs. Philosophy-English for example is only a subject entry for a book dealing with English Philosophy. Most books on current political problems and international relations have no single and precise subject. It is usually stated that the object of the subject catalogue is to show what books there are in the library on a particular subject. "On" is the ambiguity which destroys the neatness of this definition. Does it mean "devoted wholly to" or "giving substantial information about"? In either case it can be stated with certainty that no subject catalogue has ever answered this question with more than a very partial success.

There are libraries, for the most part academic libraries outside the United States, which do not possess subject catalogues. In most cases the explanation of this lack is to be found in the enormous difficulty of supplying a subject catalogue. The British Museum has not attempted to provide a subject index to books published before 1881. Some librarians have claimed that a subject catalogue is not needed in a learned library. The student is directed to books by his teachers and the more advanced worker finds his subject approach to books from bibliographies and from references in the literature itself. There is a great deal of truth in this claim. Almost all scientific research workers will begin their exploration of a subject with the appropriate subject index to periodicals and work their way back from the references found in the most recent periodical articles. This is partly because periodical articles are usually much more up to date than books but also because the references they contain, when referring to books, will detail the parts which discuss the specific problem under consideration. Even when the subject of investigation is of a more general character such as may well form the subject of a book the most frequent approach is probably through review articles and annual surveys of recent advances. Such publications not merely list books on a particular subject but attempt to estimate their worth. They also are able, because the writers have a specialized knowledge of the subject and have more

space at their disposal, to give a much more precise indication of the subject of the books and the method of treatment than any subject catalogue can provide.

These considerations apply with slightly less force to the worker in the humanities but even in this field the number of bibliographies is increasing so rapidly that there are few subjects on which fairly competent guidance cannot be obtained from bibliographies. Is the creation of a subject catalogue therefore a work of no real value? There are two opposing reasons why this is not the case. Many specialized libraries will contain works that are not listed in any bibliography, either because the library is more comprehensive than the bibliographies or because the bibliographies inevitably fail to keep up to date with the most recent literature. A subject catalogue is essential if the resources of such a library are to be fully utilized. On the other hand not every reader in a learned library is a specialist or, to be more exact, the specialist is not a specialist all the time. He needs information not only on his special subject of research but on a host of related subjects. On these related subjects he will be perfectly content with one reliable work. He can, of course, seek this work in a bibliography or in the list of books attached to an encyclopaedia article. The bibliography may be purely enumerative whereas the presence of a book on the library shelves ought to be an indication that someone has thought it worth while putting it there; also the list in either the bibliography or the encyclopaedia is necessarily restricted to books published before the work listing them. Unless the library is extremely large the reader will necessarily waste time in noting down lists of books which he must check in the author catalogue to discover that only the last on the list or perhaps none at all is in the library. A general library can certainly function without a subject catalogue but the possession of a subject catalogue is a great convenience. The reader who will miss the subject catalogue least is the man who is making a thorough survey of the literature of the subject. Those who will miss it most are the readers seeking immediate

information on specific points, a group which includes the reference staff of the library. In a highly specialized library the subject catalogue may be the most comprehensive bibliography in existence of the subject covered by the library. Even in a general library a good subject bibliography can do much to improve the completeness of future bibliographies.

There are two forms of subject catalogue which can be employed. The one provides access to information by means of words chosen to describe the different subjects. The other makes use of the notation of some system of classification. The first type is most conveniently described as the subject heading catalogue. The second is always called the classified catalogue. In the United States the subject heading catalogue is almost universally used and only three major libraries are said to possess a classified catalogue. In Great Britain the subject heading catalogue is mostly used by medium sized public libraries. Special libraries frequently use the classified catalogue and academic libraries often have no subject catalogue. The classified catalogue has become familiar to everyone since its employment in the *British National Bibliography*. In the rest of Europe and particularly in Germany the classified catalogue is more common than the subject heading catalogue.

A great deal of time has been devoted to discussion of the relative merits of two forms of subject catalogue. Much of this discussion has been unrealistically theoretical. Few cataloguers have had practical experience of both forms of catalogue and no instances have been described in which both forms of catalogue have been used to prepare the same material for the same public. The cataloguer who is starting a new subject catalogue is most likely to have given the choice of form an impartial consideration. Karl A. Baer has described how he began the recataloguing of the library of the Chemists Club with a doubt as to the possibility of employing subject headings but afterwards changed his mind. The Library of Congress staff who planned its Science and Technology Project also after some hesitation decided to use

subject headings. One factor in this decision was the belief—afterwards questioned—that the relevant section of the Library of Congress Classification was unsuitable for expansion to form the basis of a very large catalogue dealing with 100,000 specialized reports a year.

All that these instances prove is that a subject heading catalogue can function reasonably efficiently. What is more certain is that the present dominance of the subject heading catalogue is not due to the success of the arguments put forward by its supporters. Miss Pettie quotes an interesting passage from the report of the Directors of the State Library at Albany for 1911. A fire had destroyed the classified catalogue and the directors lament its destruction: "A great classed catalog such as the one destroyed in the fire is a wonderfully effective instrument for research, reference work and investigation, particularly so in the hands of a staff highly trained and expert in the knowledge and use of the Decimal classification. There are many ways in which even the best dictionary catalog can never wholly fill the place of a good classed catalog". However the decision made is to replace the classed catalogue by a dictionary catalogue and the reason given is quite simply the "need to keep in line with the best modern cataloging practice", that is to say with the fashion of the times. Forty years later D. J. Haykin, head of the division of subject cataloguing at the Library of Congress, admits that "If a balance were struck, after all logical and practical considerations are taken into account, the classed catalog might very well prove to be the more economical and useful", but like the directors of the Albany State Library he is confident that the subject heading catalogue is the one established form of subject catalogue.

It is clear that any judgement on the value of the classified catalogue must depend on a prior judgement on the nature of classification. Classification can be considered as a logical and orderly exposition of an underlying natural order. On the other hand Taube has argued that except in the biological sciences all

classification is essentially verbal. What is certain is that all existing classification schemes are admittedly imperfect and that many subdivisions do not in fact fit into a pattern of hierarchical subordination. Such an admission does not dispose of the classified catalogue. If most classification schemes possess a largely verbal element it is equally true that all subject heading catalogues are based on a system of classification. The cataloguer who draws up a list of subject headings must begin by acting as a classifier. He cannot hope to enumerate all possible specific headings within his subject except by a process of consecutive subdivision. The more thorough is his analysis of the relationships of different terms the more accurate will be his definitions and the greater will be their uniformity and consistency. F. B. Perkins, as long ago as 1879, drew attention to the many inadequacies and inconsistencies in subject headings and declared that they sprang from Cutter's failure to carry out the comprehensive analysis of all the possible relationships of each heading. Where Cutter gave up no one else has attempted to follow, though, in a more restricted way, Miss Clyde E. Pettus's *Subject headings in education* is an example of classification as a preliminary to subject headings which would be impossible on a more extended scale. What Cutter makes clear is that he considers that the use of "a well-devised network of cross-references" gives the subject heading catalogue much of the character of a classified catalogue. The references from specific to comprehensive terms imply an hierarchical subordination which is a form of classification. Such references are usually drawn up as the occasion demands and they build up a hidden classification which is likely to be less full and consistent than a system of classification which has been explicitly developed on some more consistent and unified intellectual basis.

The other argument for the superiority of the classified catalogue is based on the claim that subject headings are arrangements of works but that classification is an organization of ideas. Many books deal with very complex relationships of subjects. It

is easier to express such relationships by a classification symbol than by a subject heading because the classification symbol can represent a far more involved and complicated idea than can be put into the longest subject heading. Associated, but not as well substantiated, is the argument that the user and maker of the subject heading catalogue are liable to be led astray not merely by the presence of synonyms and partial synonyms but by a whole habit of thought which assumes that the presence of different words necessarily involves the use of different concepts.

The function of the classified catalogue is to guide the reader to the needed book by bringing together books on related subjects. There are many readers who will find this approach to be the one which serves their needs best. The man who wishes to keep up with developments in a particular field or to survey all that has been written on a particular subject will find in one sequence all the books he wants and these would probably have been widely scattered in the subject heading catalogue. The man who is seeking for information on a subject rather too small to have been often made the subject of a book will also benefit from having the more comprehensive works to which he may have to turn closely adjacent to the more specific works. In any case to get the best out of a classified catalogue the user must make some effort to master the outlines of the system of classification. If the user always approaches the subject by the index and uses the class symbol purely as a substitute for a verbal specific subject heading then he will find the classified catalogue less efficient than the subject heading catalogue because he will miss the "see also" references to lead him to the more and less specific headings. This is one reason why the classified catalogue is more popular in the specialized library where the reader is more likely to be an experienced user of the catalogue and to be familiar with the classification. In many cases of course, there is no difference at all between the subject heading catalogue and the classified catalogue. The class symbol is employed solely as a



translation of a verbal subject heading. This is proved by the practice of many American libraries, including at one time the Library of Congress, of sometimes substituting for a complete listing of early books on a particular subject a reference to the appropriate class number in the shelf list.

Such an economy of effort is one of the attractions to the librarian of the classified catalogue. If the books are classified then the intellectual effort required to construct a classified catalogue is not great. It has been stated that the classified shelf list cannot be used as a catalogue. It is true that the shelf list enters books according to their position on the shelves and makes only one entry for each book. It cannot therefore provide a subject approach for parts of series shelved together or for other books which for some other reason are not kept in the normal sequence and it gives no guide to the subsidiary subjects of a book. Both these difficulties are easily overcome. The first by the mechanical reproduction of the necessary extra entries and the second by the provision of alternative class marks. Even this is hardly an extra intellectual effort as the possibility of recording an alternative placing actually makes easier the work of the classifier. The shelf list therefore can with comparatively little effort be developed into a classified catalogue. It is true that without a verbal index it will remain a catalogue which will be of use only to those fully familiar with the classification. The most labour-saving device is to use as the index the published index to the classification. This has many disadvantages but it does work and it could be argued that in a small library where the staff make most use of the subject catalogue the extra effort involved in the creation of an index to the classified catalogue is not justified. In a larger library the inconveniences of using the published index are much greater. It is a source of annoyance for a reader to be directed to numbers under which he will find no entries. More important, the index has been constructed to guide the classifier to the right part of the classification tables, not to suggest a specific class number. It is of less use to the reader who

wishes to be directed straight to his desired book. It is therefore generally desirable to construct an index to the classified catalogue and this becomes unavoidable if the classification scheme has been frequently modified in use.

The construction of the index is best considered after the discussion of the subject heading catalogue. It is in fact a special form of this catalogue. It would be possible for a library to use for its classified catalogue a system of classification different from that employed to arrange the books on the shelves but it is unlikely that the extra effort required would ever be justified. It is not necessary for the classification used in the catalogue to be more fully developed than that required for shelf arrangement. In each case it is the subject content of the book which determines the class number and the extent of the subdivision which will be required is determined largely by the number of books on the subject. It is not essential that the final subdivision should correspond to a specific subject heading for every book placed in it. The reader in a general library searching for a book on electrical heating of greenhouses will not be inconvenienced if all books on heating greenhouses are recorded under the same number. The student searching for periodical articles will, of course, find more specific numbers essential.

There are two main reasons for the lack of widespread popularity of the classified catalogue. The one is that the classified catalogue adds nothing new to a classified library. In a small classified reference library with one series of shelving the books themselves, if dummies were inserted at alternative placings, could provide their own classified catalogue. But subjects often refuse to accommodate themselves to an organized division of knowledge. Different treatments of the same subject belong to different branches of knowledge but the whole subject can reasonably be the object of investigation. The subject heading brings together all those aspects of a subject which are scattered throughout the classification. Thus under "Swans" are assembled works dealing with anatomical, ecological, heraldic,

gastronomic, political, mythological, symbolic and aesthetic aspects of swans. Without a verbal index it is almost certain that some aspect of this subject would be overlooked by the most thorough searcher. This failure of the classified catalogue to give direct access to books on all aspects of a subject can be extended to a scepticism about the whole character of classification. Irma S. Wachtel has put this point most effectively. "The task of organizing information by means of classification so as to provide access to any portion from any point of view is one which can easily be shown to be impossible: for the very arrangement which provides easy access from one point of view, denies it from another." The basis of classification is that of class inclusion. If two classes are not included one in the other they must be exclusive. The existence of ideas which have more than one aspect makes the creation of mutually-exclusive all-inclusive classes impossible. Every idea can be classified in many different ways: therefore the weakness of classification as a tool for organizing information is due to the inherent unattainability of its basic principles. In Great Britain such propositions would be hotly contested by many. In the United States librarians tend to regard classification mainly as a method of shelf arrangement and this, as much as conservatism, has prevented any real movement for a wider use of the classified catalogue. The classified catalogue is more favoured by the specialist than by the general reader but the specialist is equally well equipped to make the best use of a subject heading catalogue in which the headings chosen consist of terms both precise and in common use both by cataloguer and user.

The alphabetico-classed catalogue is a form which in the English-speaking world disappeared in the middle years of the nineteenth century and despite Shera's comment that its possibilities have never been fully explored its disappearance appears both inevitable and desirable. It consisted of a combination of a classified and an alphabetical arrangement with main classes usually arranged alphabetically and subdivisions either by subject

or alphabetical. At one extreme it is very difficult to distinguish from the classified catalogue itself. Its arrangement of subdivisions is inevitably arbitrary and its main divisions are almost always less well defined and chosen than in a fully developed classification scheme. The main interest of the alphabetico-classed catalogue to-day lies in the belief occasionally encountered that the British Museum *Subject Index of Modern Works* belongs to this class.

G. K. Fortescue who initiated the *Subject Index* in 1886 certainly did not regard it in any way as a classified catalogue. In a paper read before the Bibliographical Society in 1911 Fortescue contrasts his own method with that of the compiler of a scientific class catalogue. The compiler of the class catalogue "begins by taking a number of sweeping class headings such as Theology, History, Sociology, Belles-lettres and so forth. He then proceeds to divide and subdivide and classify and specify until he imagines that he has arrived at something approximate to a correct classification of human knowledge. Having accomplished this more or less impossible task, he endeavours to force his book into one or other of the hundreds or thousands of classes and subclasses he has formed to receive them; his work is in vain, the books will not fit into his pigeon holes and the result is inevitable failure". The *Subject Index* is formed on the exactly opposite principle. "It aims at no logical sequence, no accurate classification. It begins at the other end by taking first the titles of the books themselves and then placing them under the headings into which they naturally fall."

Fortescue rejected classification as impracticable but he gives no explanation of the nature of the "natural headings" which he decides to use. The *Subject Index* may therefore be considered as a characteristic example of the practical English empirical approach. Unfortunately it cannot be considered a triumph of this approach. Its chief feature is the inclusion along with specific headings of a large number of comprehensive general headings which are subdivided. The subdivisions are

indicated in a schedule printed at the beginning of the entries and vary from one heading to another. The haphazard way in which headings have been adopted is indicated in the preface to the 1936-40 volume. New headings introduced into this volume include Cuneiform Inscriptions, Figures of Speech, Scandinavian Languages and Literature, Hibernation, Pain, Exiles and Sacrilege. None of these can be considered new subjects and the user may well be puzzled to know where they were hidden in earlier volumes. Dr Thomas who writes the introduction is jauntily indifferent to such niceties and concludes the list of innovations by remarking "Finally Youth Hostels after being buried under a variety of headings since the inception of the youth hostel movement now have a heading of their own." The natural headings thus prove to be purely capricious headings. The sub-headings are equally unsatisfactory. "Bibliographies of bibliography: Reference Books" combine two quite distinct classes of books. "Catalogues of selected works: miscellaneous bibliographies" is equally imprecise. It is doubtful whether it is natural to look for "pseudonyms" under the general heading "Bibliography". Books on how to gain weight are entered under Hygiene—personal. Books on how to lose weight under Corpulency. There is nothing natural or logical in this and the reader who looks under Slimming will find no guidance. Printer's rules are often employed to show a subdivision has occurred but the nature of the subdivision is not indicated. References from subdivisions are often incomplete. Under the heading Blood and Blood Vessels: Arteries and Veins, the sub-heading Composition: Corpuscles, etc., carries the reference See also Glands but it is hard to decide what book under Glands is intended by this reference.

It is easy to realize that it is difficult to remodel a work such as the *Subject Index* once it is under way. It remains true that at present the *Subject Index* presents far too many unnecessary obstacles to successful use and that it is useless to look to it for any kind of model of what a subject catalogue should be.

## THE SUBJECT CATALOGUE

The subject heading catalogue remains unquestionably the most popular form of subject catalogue in the English-speaking world as a whole, but its supremacy is not untroubled. There is widespread dissatisfaction with various aspects of its development and Miss Pettee—whose experience of the subject heading catalogue is unequalled, complains that it lacks an adequate philosophy. Philosophy is rather a pretentious term. What is certainly lacking is a more adequate definition of aims and a more precise indication of the means by which these aims can be achieved. Many of the weaknesses of the subject heading catalogue can be traced back to its origins. Cutter himself shows a confusion of definition and uncertainty of objective both of which have never been eliminated subsequently. Cutter states that the principle of specific entry provides the "distinctive characteristic of the subject heading catalogue". His rule is "Enter a work under its subject heading and not under the heading of a class which includes that subject". The precision of this distinction is soon impaired by exceptions. The first of these is that a subject must be grouped under the class which includes it if it has not attained "a certain individuality as objects of inquiry and be given some sort of name". The second, which has far more disastrous consequences, is based upon the observation that the public are accustomed to think of certain subjects in connection with their including classes. To satisfy this habit of thought Cutter permits entry under both class and specific subject. He is clearly unhappy about this exception to the rule of specific entry for he sees that if double entry is made in all cases where it may seem useful the bulk of the catalogue will be enormously increased whereas if specific entry is made according to the cataloguer's judgement, which he correctly defines as "the prepossessions and accidental associations of the cataloguer" the result will be confusion.

Later cataloguers do little more than repeat Cutter. They uphold the principle of specific entry but subordinate it to the over-riding need to adopt an entry which the reader will naturally

look for and give no guidance as to how such a naturally acceptable heading is to be established. Thus Miss Pettee claims that the natural approach of many readers is through the more comprehensive topic and that the degree of specificity of any heading must depend upon the needs of the users of the particular library. "Neither logic nor consistency but usefulness known or supposed has always been the primary criterion for the admission of a subject heading." Haykin is apparently more consistent in his approach to specificity "the heading should be as specific as the topic it is intended to cover". If a book is not entered under the most specific heading how can the reader estimate how broad the heading will be under which entry will be made? The argument is unanswerable but Haykin does not stand by it. For him too the catalogue must be "reader focused" and so "There are limits to the principle of specificity beyond which its application does not appear to be in the best interests of the reader".

The result of the application of these in part conflicting principles is that all subject heading catalogues are marked by a degree of uncertainty and duplication. Identical material is entered under different headings which provide a different approach and there is double entry under both general and specific headings. It is in many cases impossible for the user to be certain under which heading a particular book will have been put because he will be unable to gauge the cataloguer's estimate of the reader's approach. Thus Haykin considers "Automobiles" an adequate heading but thinks "It is nevertheless, not unreasonable, at the same time, to single out *Ford Automobiles* either because of the number of books on the subject, or because it may be considered a species or special type of automobile". It is impossible to believe that any British reader or even any young American reader would really think of a Ford as more "a special type of automobile" than a Rolls Royce or Austin. Miss Pettee admits that the inconsistencies of duplicate entries under broader and more specific headings cause much confusion "but the practice arose in response to the demand for ready reference which



is the major function of the small and medium sized library". She also considered that it is extremely difficult to distinguish between closely related headings. Even when a distinction can be clearly defined the "meticulously correct term" which the cataloguer has established may be unknown to the reader and it is therefore probably better "to assemble closely related topics under the larger term". That this is not always convenient is admitted by Miss Pettee who agrees that "some sub-types under general headings so scatter material under half a dozen sub-headings of general topics which do not readily occur to the intelligent reader". Her conclusion is not encouraging "it is beyond the bounds of common sense to collect all aspects of every topic under the term or phrase which exactly defines the aspect. At present the best we can do is to trust to the reference assistant or readers' adviser. The material is listed somewhere in the catalogue and they are experts in finding it".

The subject heading catalogue it can be agreed is not a precise instrument. Some investigators have maintained that it satisfies 70% of user's demands but the claim that it gives direct access to information is vitiated by the inevitable difficulties in stumbling upon the heading under which the information is recorded. It has been said that no subject heading catalogue has ever been constructed solely of specific headings. In reality no effort has ever been made to construct a catalogue out of specific headings and indeed no great success has been reached in defining a specific heading. Many entries in the large subject heading catalogues—such as Art and Philosophy in that of the Library of Congress—are indistinguishable from class entries. One necessity of these large group headings is subdivision. Haykin claims that "Subdivision is distinguished from qualification in that it is ordinarily used not to limit the scope of the subject matter as such but to provide for its arrangement in the catalog by the form which the subject matter of the book takes or the limits of time and place set for the subject matter". To the user this distinction is not always clear. Subdivision in history appears to conflict with



specificity. The criterion for subdivision by country appears often to be the number of books under a heading and the necessity of splitting them up in some way. Only thus can one justify the geographical subdivision of euthanasia. The arbitrary character of the rules permitting subdivision introduces such anomalies as the heading *Birds—California* for a book on the Gnatcatchers of California. Here, as always, with the subject heading catalogue, the argument returns to the stumbling block of specificity and this in turn leads on to the uncertainty of aim as well as method in the subject heading catalogue. As Lubetzky says the reason why so many subject headings cover a wide variety of specific headings is that "the specificity of the subject heading is circumscribed by the underlying pattern of subject organization. To assign specific subject headings [to all possible specific aspects of a wide subject] would obviously complicate greatly the subject structure of the catalog and would serve to separate rather than bring together these related works".

It is not really putting a false emphasis on Lubetzky's words to ask what the subject heading catalogue has to do with bringing together related works. Obviously in one sense books on the same subject are really books on related subjects. The fundamental difficulty of the subject heading catalogue is the difficulty in deciding when a difference of degree in approach and scope results in a different kind of subject. But over and above this difficulty the subject heading cataloguer has burdened himself with a further difficulty. He has attempted to combine with his own method the advantages of the classified catalogue. Cutter makes this quite clear. The subject heading catalogue sets out with the object of securing facility of reference by direct access to specific headings but "having attained that object ... is at liberty to try to secure some of the advantages of classification and system in its own way. Its subject entries ... thrown together, without any logical arrangement, in most absurd proximity—are a mass of utterly disconnected particles without any relation to one another, each useful in itself but only by itself. But by a

well-devised network of cross-references the mob becomes an army of which each part is capable of assisting many other parts. The effective force of the catalog is immensely increased". There is in this passage a clearly discernible hankering after the classified catalogue and even a half repressed feeling that the classified is the better and "more correct" form. There is nothing "absurd" in "Abscess" followed by "Absenteeism" unless it is felt that there should be a logical connexion between the headings in a subject catalogue. No one has ever found anything absurd in the chance collocations of the author catalogue. Two consequences follow from this sneaking respect for the classified catalogue. One is the enormous multiplication of cross-references. The object of the cataloguer is not merely to record books under their specific subjects but also to indicate under a given heading books dealing with a larger subject which includes the specific subject, books dealing with specific aspects of the specific subject and books dealing with subjects related to the specific subject. Miss Pettee finds in this multiplicity of cross-references and the inter-relationships brought together under names the supreme claim to distinction of the subject-heading catalogue. It is a distinction which is dearly bought as anyone who has used either the catalogue of the Library of Congress or even its *List of Subject Headings* must agree. It is the mass of "see" and "see also" references which bulk out the catalogue so enormously and which consume so much of the cataloguer's time. The supposed needs of the reader inspires Haykin's rule that references should be made from all synonyms and yet the intelligent reader could readily turn to another synonym if he found no entry under his first choice whilst the less intelligent reader will often regard as synonyms terms which are in fact distinguishable. The cross-references certainly help to boost the size of the catalogue. The student is appalled when he learns from Haykin that in the Library of Congress Public Catalogue between Civil Defence and Civilian Defence there are 10,646 subject entries and references and 720 title entries. Of these, 3,100 are under Civil Law,

4,500 under Civil Procedure and 2,000 under Civil Servants. Does the very size of such a catalogue prove frustrating? Haykin agrees that the user of the catalogue is rarely attempting a systematic search. He is looking for a book on a broad subject or a specific topic. Miss Pettee goes further: "A cataloguer in one of our larger libraries who was assigned the task of replacing soiled and worn cards discovered that replacements were entirely within the first two inches of the file; that was the limit of the reader's patience."

The other consequence of the partially unconscious effort to keep up with the classified catalogue is the multiplication of headings which are purely class headings. Miss Pettee approves of three entries for a book on the *Cults of Lesbos*. "Lesbos" "Cultus, Greek" "Mythology, Greek". None of these is a specific heading. The justification for the second heading is "If all these special cults are given a second entry under the general heading Cultus, Greek, we have a very useful file easy to consult. The small topics such as Hades, Zeus, etc., scattered through the catalogue require a tedious search by the student anxious to collect them." This last sentence is a denial of the whole principle of the subject heading catalogue or rather it shows that the active principle has been "apparent convenience". The subject cataloguer has tended to make entries under any heading which seems likely to be of use to a reader even if this involves considerable duplication or the substitution of a more general for a more specific entry.

The subject heading catalogue is a working instrument but it is a costly instrument and often fails to secure the convenience of the reader which it has selected as its chief good. Miss Pettee instances a book *The listening post: eighteen years on Vatican hill* which the Library of Congress enters under Papacy—History; Popes—Court; Catholic Church—Relations (Diplomatic) but not under Catholic Church—History—20th century. From the title of the book and the account given of its contents it would appear that the third heading is the most specific but a case can be made for all except perhaps the second. What is more certain

is the justice of Miss Pettee's comment "If by chance the reader (seeking information on the subject of this book) happens to think of one of these captions and his patience holds out in going through the files which include unsorted literature of all dates he may see and select this title". The alternative to a mass of unsorted titles is a labyrinth of subdivisions in which even the most experienced user must frequently lose his way.

There have been many proposals for tightening the rather loose structure of the subject heading catalogue. Haykin has proposed a closer adherence to the principle of specific subjects but is not prepared to make this an absolute rule. Dr H. B. Van Hoesen has drawn up "Twelve rules for economy in subject headings" of which Miss Pettee selects as the most important: eliminate all general headings when the specific is fully adequate; avoid double entry by substituting references to specific subdivisions; combine, with cross reference, headings which are so closely related that there is danger of duplication and confusion between entries under each heading. Miss M. L. Prevost suggests that the weakness of the subject heading catalogue springs from Cutter's rule 175, and proposes a revision to Schwartz's rule to enter all compound subject names under the specific noun. Cutter rejected Schwartz's rule because it conflicted with his principle of selecting entries which a reader would naturally select. Schwartz's proposal would put subjects "under words where nobody unacquainted with the rule would expect to find them". Cutter admits that his own rule is somewhat vague and often of doubtful application, an admission which Miss Prevost considers to be borne out only too clearly by the experience of later cataloguers. Cutter's own examples of the difficulties of entry under the noun are rather silly but he raises the real issue when he points out that "to adopt the noun (the class) as the heading is to violate the fundamental principle of the dictionary catalogue". Miss Prevost can demonstrate that Schwartz's principle has many advantages over the uncertainties of present practice but in doing this she is also proving that some form of

classified catalogue has many advantages over the subject heading catalogue.

The latest rules for subject headings were drawn up by the Science and Technology Project in the Library of Congress. These rules are described by Mr Gull as based on the preference of the most specific heading and the direct form. The disadvantage of the direct form is found to be the scattering of very closely related information but the direct form has the advantages of being usually shorter. It also presents the user with only that part of the catalogue in which he is interested and avoids the danger of concealment of information in a long sequence of subdivisions under the noun entry. Some of Gull's criticisms of Miss Prevost are unjustified. She argues for entry under the "specific noun" not necessarily under an indirect form of a general noun. Her principles do not preclude the use of such headings as "Fighters", "Bombers" or "Waveguides". It is true that entry under the noun does often introduce ambiguity. Does Planes—Transport mean Transport Planes or The Transport of Planes? Miss Prevost would presumably get round this difficulty by the use of her prepositional phrases in parentheses which are disregarded in filing except for the purpose of keeping entries with the same qualifying phrase together. The great advantage which Mr Gull and his associates had was that they were working for a very limited group of users, all scientists trained in the same branches of science and therefore using the same terms. Mr Gull remarks that the daily work of the subject heading cataloguer is hard enough but it is much harder when the subject headings are to be put at the disposal of a less homogeneous public. It does not therefore follow that the rules which were found satisfactory for the Science and Technology Project index would make much difference to a general catalogue. Indeed although there is some useful advice on the technique of constructing a subject catalogue there is nothing new in the rules themselves. The instruction to choose the most sensible of different possible arrangements of terms is an instruction to rely on the cata-

loguer's own judgement. Such a judgement may have value in a restricted field but in the more general library Cutter's structures remain true.

Taube and Gull, who were responsible for the Science and Technology Project rules, have since gone on to devise in "Uniterms" an entirely different approach to subject indexing. This system is designed for scientific reports dealing with some specialized topic and not for books which are normally far more general. The arguments with which this system is supported have, however, a bearing on all aspects of subject cataloguing. Taube writes "No actual index ever attempts to list in alphabetical order all the permutations of multiple-term descriptions. But the selection of permutations to be included or omitted is a subjective factor which in some instances requires a quality of judgement from the indexer which he may not possess and a clairvoyance on the part of the searcher which he does not possess. Indexes break down from the attempt to include too many permutations or prove unsatisfactory because they do not include enough". That the difficulty lies not in the inadequacy of the cataloguer but in the nature of the material is shown by the account given of the discussions of the possibilities of dividing up multiple-word terms. Even a group of cataloguers sharing a common background of discussion and having the same objective in view constantly failed to agree on whether a particular term could be divided without doing violence to the meaning of the term. Standard library practice assumes that, in general, it is possible to express any specific topic in a single word or phrase but this assumption is false. "There are many specific complex ideas which cannot be expressed in specific words or phrases plus non-topical subdivisions but only as the specific product or relationship of two or more general terms." Taube's application of this principle is the "uniterm method". In this method every document to be indexed is given a number. The subject of the document is analysed into the necessary number of Uniterms. A card is made for each Uniterm and the number

of the document is entered on each card. The searcher breaks down the subject he is looking for into its Uniterms and notes down the numbers of the documents under each term. Numbers which appear under all the Uniterms will be the numbers of documents dealing with the required specific subject. From this crude and oversimplified description the method may appear impossibly complicated and indirect. Its exponents have certainly shown that in fact it is a method which deserves the careful attention of all indexers. It is not designed and could not be applied to a general library catalogue but the concept of bibliographical co-ordination as a method of subject limitation is of great importance. The specific subject of books is often a collocation of two general subjects. There is a book on *The attitude of the catholic church towards witchcraft and the allied practices of sorcery and magic*. The Library of Congress enters this under Magic, Witchcraft and Catholic Church, History. None of these is a specific subject entry. A reader who knows of the existence of this book or who seeks information on this specific subject and who looks for the entry in the subject catalogue will be faced with the task of examining every entry under whichever heading he chooses. A tedious and time-consuming task in even a small library and in a large library an almost impossible one. The two headings Catholic Church—Magic and Magic—Catholic Church would lead directly to the specific subject. Admittedly these headings are ambiguous. Catholic Church—Magic might mean "the magical elements in the Catholic Church". In this case the various possible aspects of the relationships between the Catholic Church and magic all form part of one fairly specific subject but in some cases the two general items coming together are insufficient to define precisely the specific subject. For example there are many possible aspects of the relationship between England and Germany. The introduction of a third component in the heading offers no insuperable difficulties and it may also be possible to use prepositional phrases in italic or parentheses as suggested by Miss Prevost.



## THE SUBJECT CATALOGUE

Many proposed improvements in the subject catalogue remain purely hypothetical and cannot be discussed with any adequacy. Many trains of thought are however reflected in one now well established index. This is the alphabetical key to the classified entries in the British National Bibliography. The method is based on Ranganathan's concept of "chain procedure" but the results have something in common with those of very different theorists. The entry appears not in the conventional form of a heading with subdivisions but as a chain of independent terms and the total meaning arises from the conjunction of all the terms. Superficially there is something similar to the common practice in subject headings of adding a word in parentheses to determine the specific meaning of the phrase. The chain procedure is distinct not merely in carrying out this procedure much more systematically but in being based on the classification. The entry in effect is a verbal translation of the class number beginning with the last subdivision which forms the first term of the index entry. In a full entry each division in the class number will be represented by a word. In practice some terms are omitted. It is never necessary to give the equivalent of the "hundred number" of the Dewey classification and intermediate terms are omitted when the indexer considers this can be done without impairing the adequacy of the resulting description. Thus the entries to describe a book on

*Dielectric heating for setting adhesives are:*

Dielectrics: Heating: Setting: Synthetic resin adhesives:

Furniture manufactures 684. 1

Furniture: Manufactures

Adhesives: Furniture manufactures

Synthetic resins: Adhesives: Furniture manufactures

Heating: Setting: Synthetic resin adhesives: Furniture manufactures

It will be noted that the order of the class number is retained and



indeed must never be broken but that it is possible to break into the number at any point. That is: the order of the index phrase is always backwards from the more specific to the more general. Each entry contains within itself the "See also" references to more general heading. "See also" references from the general heading to the more specific are not needed as the reader who is directed to the class number of a more general section will be led by the classification to the more specific numbers. It is claimed that this method is automatic in operation and does not depend on the judgement of the individual cataloguer. That is not entirely true as clearly there may have to be a choice between different words which might be used as the equivalent of the class number. We cannot escape from synonyms but we are freed from difficulties of "near synonyms" and the insuperable problems of deciding whether or not a two word phrase can be split without violence to the meaning. The terms in the index entry do not have to make sense in themselves but only in the context of the phrase as a whole. The method may appear to demand a large number of entries for each item. In the example quoted there are five entries but it would be difficult to be more economical with other methods or indeed to devise any subject heading which could convey the specific subject of the work. It must also be remembered that the entries for the intermediate stages will be the main entries for many other books. The "See also" references to more general headings in the conventional subject heading catalogue are found only under the specific entry in question. In the *B.N.B.* index every entry can be and, if the method were used for a large library catalogue, would be, a main heading as well as an added entry for a book already entered under a more specific heading. The importance of this achievement can be measured by the fact that in an analysis of a well constructed subject index Gull found there were 92 cross references to 100 headings.

Miss Pettee found that the superiority of the subject heading catalogue rests upon its ability to collect material from different

fields under a topical name. This she considers its supreme distinction and in an almost lyrical passage she writes: "The parallel lines of our classification schemes are drawn through the flat surface of plane geometry. The interrelationships of a topical name demand another dimension. Names reach up and over the surface. Sugar, for example, many handed like a Hindu god reaches up a hand from Chemistry, from Agriculture, from Applied Arts. These hands clasp in the air under the single term Sugar, irrespective of the classification map or the plane surface below. In a dictionary catalog the logical analysis of a classed catalog is exalted to a third dimension. The logic transcends the limits of a classification scheme, for the interrelationships of the special topics reach out into the whole field of knowledge."

This rather high flown description clearly applies much more to the *B.N.B.* index than to the best of subject heading catalogues. The *B.N.B.* brings together under the topical name all the aspects which are scattered throughout the classification and at the same time by its chain procedure method and by relating entries to their place in the classification is able to define each aspect more precisely and more economically than the best subject index. Miss Pettee agrees that it is necessary to construct a classified arrangement of terms in order to distinguish between headings which are very close in meaning. Even a poor classification system is likely to have advantages over a rough draft drawn up for a special purpose—even more over a background classification which remains always merely implicit and undeveloped. The Dewey classification is unsatisfactory but the combination of the Dewey classification and the "chain procedure" index gives a more satisfactory and economical subject catalogue than has previously been obtained. It may be claimed that the system of the *B.N.B.* is not exactly a classified catalogue. The verbal index and the classified portion are of equal importance. Indeed the index might be considered the more important. The compilers advise even readers familiar with the classification to make their first approach to a subject always through the index. It might be

considered that the classified portion was indeed only an adjunct to the verbal index, a combination of the shorthand notation and a series of linear references. If this interpretation is considered too forced it must still be agreed that the union of chain procedure index and classification produces a combination as new as it is powerful.

One minor advantage of the new method is that the cataloguer is delivered from the danger of giving over much importance to purely verbal distinctions. The subject is expressed as a class number and then retranslated into a verbal form. Not that all the hazards of verbal indexing can be avoided. The user of the B.N.B. index is sometimes at a loss to understand why the term which appears to him the most useful is omitted from the index and may occasionally be perplexed by verbal inconsistencies. But there are imperfections arising from inescapable human shortcomings and are not inherent in the system itself.

A point which constantly emerges in the discussion of the subject catalogue is the change in meaning of terms or the substitution of new terms for old. This is not really a subject which deserves the time which has been devoted to it. In the subject heading catalogue the position is quite clear. Sometimes one term replaces another in use without the content changing. Haykin quotes *Domestic Economy*, *Domestic Science*, *Home Economics* and states that the first was in use before the turn of the century, the second before World War I and the third is now the term in general use. The English reader will be surprised to learn that the use of the phrase *Domestic Science* dates one as badly as this but he will agree that all these terms cover roughly the same subject. It is impossible to find an up-to-date term for "Zymotic Diseases" as this is a concept which is no longer current. In a different way "plague" cannot be used as a heading to cover works published both before and after the close of the nineteenth century. In the earlier works the term has a far wider and less precise meaning. A classification system has a minor advantage inasmuch as it can express terms which enjoy an

intense but passing vogue such as "Auto-intoxication" or "Stress" in their more general and hence more permanent aspects, but it is even more open to the danger of a radical change in the concept of the organization of knowledge. Many distinguished physicists maintain that changes in their subject have made it impossible to apply existing classification schemes to the classification of modern books and that it is impossible to use the same scheme for modern books and for books published thirty or even less years ago. This indeed is the heart of the problem. It has been frequently remarked in passing that the task of the subject cataloguer is relatively easy when he is addressing himself to a limited group who share a common outlook and vocabulary. The task of the cataloguer in the general library is far more difficult. It becomes almost impossible when he endeavours to embrace the multitudinous changes of concept and vocabulary from Aristotle to the present day. The solution is some division of the catalogue by date. After all the reader who wants a book on glass-blowing is not likely to want both a seventeenth century treatise and a modern manual. The rare reader who does is not too inconvenienced if he has to look in two catalogues and the majority who want only modern works are greatly helped if the files they consult are not cluttered with outdated titles. And within both the "old" and the "modern" catalogue the arrangement of each heading is best by date. Domestic Economy and Home Economics may share the same general meaning but works published when one of these terms was in the ascendant will have much in common. Such is the force of the spirit of the age and of pure imitation that even with so scientific a subject as Cataloguing the shrewd reader will be able to deduce much of the content of a book from a study of its publication date.

*Descriptive Cataloguing and Other Considerations*

THE discussion of cataloguing problems has up till now been confined to those which arise from the choice of heading. The heading may be the most important but it is still the smallest part of a catalogue entry. Finding the correct heading is the first step in finding the required book but many books can be entered under the same heading. In recent years American cataloguers have narrowed the term descriptive cataloguing to that part of the entry, following the heading, which is concerned with the identification and description of specific works. The term is a useful abbreviation in some cases but the division between the two parts of the author entry which it implies is both artificial and unfortunate. In almost every library the same cataloguer will select the heading and provide the description of a book. Frequently the two react on one another very closely. Indeed in some forms of catalogue the heading and the body of the entry may be the same as for example in the entry for a periodical or the body of the entry may only be distinctive when read in conjunction with the heading as when it consists of a word such as "poems", "essays".

It is therefore a pity that the most recent cataloguing codes available provide separate rules for author and title entries and for descriptive cataloguing. The division is not the result of design. The first edition of the new ALA rules covered all aspects of the "author" catalogue. When the rules were first published it was the part dealing with descriptive cataloguing which received the heaviest criticism and in the end the ALA agreed to withdraw it on the understanding that the Library of Congress would publish its own rules. The resulting *Rules for descriptive cataloging in the Library of Congress* (1949) is much more than a

statement of the practice of one great library. A large number of leading American cataloguers were drawn into the prolonged discussions which preceded the publication of the rules. In 1946 Mr H. H. Henkle of the Library of Congress produced his very valuable *Studies of descriptive cataloging*. This was submitted to an advisory committee of nine, two-thirds of whom came from outwith the Library of Congress. This committee in turn published its own report and the first (1947) draft of the rules was modified in the light of further outside criticism before the revised edition was issued. The *Rules for descriptive cataloging in the Library of Congress* have been officially adopted by the American Library Association and can be taken to represent the agreed American code. As such they have met with an almost unbroken approval in striking contrast with the widespread condemnation of the *ALA Cataloging Rules. Author and title entries*. The British cataloguer will not be disposed to mar this concord of approval but he will perhaps be a little less inclined to regard the new code as a deliverer. Few British libraries have in fact found it possible or desirable to indulge in all the detailed description prescribed by the Joint Code. The *Library of Congress Rules* are extremely valuable but for the most part they still prescribe a degree of description few British libraries find necessary.

The real importance of the *Library of Congress Rules* and still more of *Studies of descriptive cataloging* is that they start by defining the object of descriptive cataloguing and then seek to show how the object is to be attained. The position adopted is not new. The object of descriptive cataloguing is to distinguish the book described from other works and from other editions of the same work. To attain this object it is necessary to set out the information contained in the entry in a standardized form, or, to use the language of the *Studies* to present an "integrated" entry which will correspond with the entries for other books and best meet the needs of the majority of readers. There are very few who would challenge the two positions. Some cataloguers whose

views are recorded in the *Studies* claimed that what is really needed is "bibliographical cataloguing" but were not very good at explaining what this meant. One claimed that a catalogue entry should contain sufficient information to enable a bibliographer to reconstruct the entry in his own form. It is hardly necessary to point out that "bibliographical cataloguing" would lead to very shoddy bibliography. The kind and degree of attention which a bibliographer ought to give to a work he is describing is quite different from that which it is reasonable to demand from a cataloguer. Differences between issues or even editions which it is the task of the bibliographer to uncover may be determined by minor variations in arrangement or even in the wording of the text. Another interpretation of bibliographical cataloguing is that contained in the Joint Code rule 136 which states that the title is to be "an exact transcript of the title page", apart from the omission of mottoes and "other non-essential matter of any kind". The superstitious reverence for the title page which this rule encourages had never become fully accepted in British cataloguing practice—the British Museum rules permit transposition of parts of the title—but it has led to some extraordinary performances whose only merit has been to gratify their compilers' satisfaction at their own ingenuity.

In practice the Library of Congress *Rules* do not confine themselves to the recording of significant features which are needed to identify and distinguish a book. These features do, it must be agreed, vary from book to book. It has often been pointed out that references to other books in monographs or reference works are usually limited to author, short title, edition, editor and date and that such references rarely give rise to ambiguity. In the overwhelming majority of books this amount of information is certainly adequate. There are cases, however, in which more is needed. The Library of Congress rules (3 : 1A) state "To distinguish one work from another, the title (together with the author's name as heading) is generally sufficient; for anonymous and pseudonymous works, other details, such as the statement

which veils rather than names the author, or the imprint, are necessary in order to distinguish two works with the same title. To distinguish one edition from another of the same work, one or more of the following must be known: number or name of the edition, name of the editor, illustrator, translator, or publisher, date of publication, name of the series to which the edition belongs, or some detail of physical description such as the number of pages or volumes in the work. Since the user of the catalog rarely knows all these details about the work he is seeking, and since in a growing library it cannot be foreseen which of them will be necessary to distinguish the various editions to be acquired, it is essential to include in each catalog entry all pertinent information of this type."

In the choice of heading the same principles apply to the catalogue of all libraries. In descriptive cataloguing the size of the library has a direct bearing on the catalogue entry. The caution of the last sentence of the quotation may seem absurd in a medium sized library of under a million volumes. It may not be so absurd in the context of a library the size of the Library of Congress. It is, however, doubtful in even the largest library how often the number of pages has been the sole distinction between two editions. The eighteenth century publisher was accustomed to issue important books in both a large—folio or quarto—or small—octavo or duodecimo—format in the same year and some editions of some popular modern "classics" may be distinguished primarily by the name of the illustrator but is it justifiable to base a code on these exceptions? In many cases the author, title and date are adequate to distinguish an edition. Adding to these the edition statement and the name of editor and translator will deal adequately with all but a very small proportion of all books. If the real purpose of descriptive cataloguing is to identify and distinguish a work then other details could be omitted until the need for their presence was made evident. The Library of Congress is, of course, cataloguing not only for itself but for many other libraries. It may therefore feel that if its catalogue entries are to



be of value to other libraries they cannot be based solely on the immediate situation in the Library of Congress. It is to be feared, however, that the idea of bibliographical cataloguing is by no means dead. All printed library catalogues are in fact used as bibliographies. A bookseller for example will check the state of a book he is offering by comparing it with the description in one of the great published library catalogues. Such use may be legitimate but it is desirable to distinguish between it and the purely library use of a catalogue. It would then be possible to avoid the absurdity of the card catalogue of a library of a few thousand volumes being loaded with details entirely irrelevant to its function. It is from this point of view unfortunate that the *British National Bibliography* should also act as an agency for centralized cataloguing. A national bibliography gives details of pages, illustrations etc., not because these are needed to identify the work but because the potential purchaser naturally wishes to have all the information he can get to enable him to estimate whether he will get value for his money, though whether any purchaser is really interested in the detailed analysis of forms of illustration in which the *British National Bibliography* finds it necessary to indulge is very doubtful.

The Library of Congress *Rules* themselves make it clear that their sole task is not merely to identify a work. Rule 3 : 10 states "The place of publication, particularly if it is not a large publishing center, may suggest a probable local viewpoint of the author. The publisher's name may also suggest a viewpoint or bias (especially when the publisher is a society or institution) or may be an indication of the quality either of the subject matter or the physical make-up of the work." This is all quite true but it would have been helpful if the rules had distinguished more sharply between information which is necessary to distinguish a work and other useful information. Date is always needed to distinguish a work, place of publication is frequently needed but as countless catalogues and even bibliographies show, the name of the publisher can almost always be dispensed with, a fact which does not

invalidate the reasons for inclusion which have been quoted.

The British Museum rule 25 states that the description of a book consists primarily of a transcript of so much of its title page as is necessary to show all that the book contains and to give all necessary information as to editors, translators, illustrators and writers of supplementary or subordinate parts. If we interpret "necessary" to mean that illustrators and writers of supplementary parts are included only when it has been decided that an added entry under their name is justifiable this rule can be taken as a satisfactory guide and this information together with the date will identify most books.

The size of the book may as the Library of Congress *Rules* suggest be of value in tracing the volume on the shelves or in deciding its suitability for inter-library loan. It very rarely identifies the book or edition though this can be done by the format interpreted in early books by chain lines and water mark and in later works by size and number of leaves in a sheet. The binder can easily take a couple of centimetres off a book. He cannot change its format. If descriptive cataloguing is restricted severely to identifying editions then even the format and place of publication need be given only when it has been proved to be necessary.

Information which is rarely or never needed to identify may still be worth recording. The Library of Congress arguments for giving the place of publication and name of publisher are sound though it is hard to see the value of giving (3 : 12B2) the name of the agent who distributes the publication of a society. The value of "series notes" varies with the importance and well-defined character of the series. In many cases the series note conveys no useful information. Dissertation notes etc. are surely merely a convention. What is the significance of a work being a thesis? Contents notes are really of use only when a work is in many volumes and then of most use when the work is in progress. If the catalogue is to describe the placing of "reading lists" or "chronological lists of the author's works" why not give the titles of each chapter? Notes of bibliographical relationships to

other books—sequels, variant titles, etc., are of great value when they can be provided. Notes such as “fictionized biography” or “Textbook for grade three” are much more doubtful. Statement of any imperfections in the copy being catalogued is necessary and so is an account of any noteworthy additions, e.g. MS. notes by a well-known hand. The “At head of title” note is sometimes useful and sometimes otiose. Its routine inclusion implies an adherence to that superstitious respect for the title page which has in theory been discarded.

The collation is hardly ever needed to identify a book. Its other purposes are obscure. The information a statement of the number of pages in a book provides of the actual size of the book can be very small. Some books of 200 pages contain less words than pamphlets of thirty pages. The great objection to the collation is that it is either intolerably time consuming or inaccurate. Thus the Library of Congress *Rules* state that the last numbered page of each section is recorded. An unnumbered section is recorded if it amounts to one fifth of the book or is of special importance, i.e. is mentioned in the contents notes. Separately paged or unpaginated sections consisting of advertising matter are disregarded but advertising matter contained in the same sequence as the text is included. This means that it may be necessary to add a note to record the pages devoted to advertisements. Otherwise a work which contains 124 pages of which the last nine are advertisements might be taken to be a different edition from a copy which had had the advertisements removed. The *Rules* do not produce a statement of pagination upon which a bibliographer can rely in all cases and yet demand a considerable expenditure of time by the cataloguer. It is not surprising that the rules for simplified cataloguing in the Library of Congress ask for no more than the number of the last numbered page or a simple “i v.” if the pagination is complicated.

It is often of value to a reader to know whether a book is illustrated. As the quality of reproduction is usually superior when a special quality of paper is used it may be worth while to

distinguish between plates and other illustrations. Does it matter to anyone whether an illustration is coloured or not or whether an illustration is folded? The number of plates is often of interest but there is no great significance in one being a frontispiece or a portrait. The Library of Congress *Rules* have the advantage of not encouraging the fantastic distinctions in which the *British National Bibliography* finds it necessary to indulge.

It must be reiterated that the amount of descriptive cataloguing which is profitable varies with the size of the library and the nature of the catalogue. Much of the cataloguing of the Library of Congress is still avowedly bibliographical (cf. *Rules* top of p. 27). That is to say it sets out to provide a description of a book which can be used as a standard of a perfect copy, by readers far removed from the library. Such a description is undoubtedly often useful in a printed catalogue although it is the less useful as it can be only partially achieved. In a catalogue which can never be used except in immediate contiguity to the books catalogued the value of all information which is not needed to distinguish a particular edition is very slight. When books cannot be consulted on open shelves but have to be selected from the catalogue then all kinds of information can possibly help the reader in making his selection and the choice of this information must be left to each library. Some East European countries where libraries are playing an active part in adult education put on each catalogue card an indication of the degree of literacy required for attempting to read the book described. Can this be brought within the Library of Congress definition of "defining the scope and contents" of a book? The phrase is elastic enough to permit a very wide interpretation. The more specialized and the more subjective any information added to a catalogue entry the more limited its usefulness is.

The weakness of the Library of Congress *Rules* is that they do not recognize sufficiently bluntly the essentially approximate nature of the information which is added to a catalogue entry not really because it helps to identify a book but because it conveys

some information of value about the book. As a result of this failure practices are sometimes prescribed which are not elaborate enough to provide a full bibliographical description and yet are more elaborate than the ends they can achieve warrant. The strength of the *Rules* is the guidance they give on the presentation of a standardized entry. The title page is regarded as the natural description of the book but it is not considered necessary to follow the title page exactly. Essential statements appearing elsewhere than on the title page may be inserted in their proper sequence. The order of title, sub-title, imprint is regarded as fixed and in general the order preferred is title, sub-title, author statement (if needed) edition statement (including translator, illustrator, etc.) imprint. These together make up the "body of the entry" and are presented in the terms used in the book itself. The collation is the cataloguer's own description of the book expressed in standard bibliographical terminology. In doubtful cases the need for clarity is put first. Thus a fictitious or imaginary imprint may be recorded either in the conventional order or in the form in which it appears on the title page depending upon which one results in the more intelligible statement.

Little reference has been made in the course of these discussions to those systems of limited or restricted catalogue which have been employed in some libraries and notably in the Library of Congress. Our task has been to define the objects of the catalogue and to examine how these objects can be achieved. Limited cataloguing does not really enter into this subject as it is essentially an administrative device to procure economy. The very fact that certain economies are possible does contribute data to be used in our attempt to understand the character of the catalogue. But each fact has to be interpreted in the light of a general body of theory and knowledge. The Library of Congress "no conflict" rule is in a different category from mere restrictions on added entries. The existence of directions in the same library for the collective cataloguing of material of small importance indicates a distinction which will always be valid. A one-page leaflet form-

DESCRIPTIVE CATALOGUING AND OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

ing part of a single series does not deserve the same degree of cataloguing attention as a full sized work. In other than these specialized cases the need for "limited" cataloguing should be removed by a satisfactory cataloguing code. Cutter's "Full", "Medium" and "Short" cataloguing inevitably implies that "full" cataloguing contains information which is not really essential as it can be omitted without damaging the catalogue entry. A catalogue entry should contain no item which is not necessary. This sentence, with its suggestion that entries in all catalogues should follow the same pattern, may appear to conflict with earlier statements on the different value of the collation in different catalogues. It may also be interpreted as re-formulating a doubt as to the status of the collation in the entry. To return to the general question of the desirability of different degrees of cataloguing it can be accepted at once that various forms of listing will achieve some of the results of the catalogue. An entry such as "Virgil translated Dryden" will serve for certain purposes. It will certainly show the reader who needs no more than some text of Dryden's translation that here is a book which at least contains some of what he wants. It is possible to abbreviate titles drastically and still produce a finding list which will work most of the time. A cataloguing code should aim at producing a catalogue which will meet all appropriate demands. There is no need to make special provision for those who must make do with a less satisfactory instrument. It is even more undesirable to produce a code in the knowledge that hardly any library will follow it as it stands. The "modified Joint Codes" which are followed in so many British libraries are a testimony to this danger.

The centralizing of cataloguing is an administrative and not a cataloguing topic. The nature of the catalogue entry is the same wherever it is made. The cataloguer may be expected to view centralized cataloguing with distrust as it will appear to be a threat to his own vested interests. He need have few fears on this account. One American librarian has expressed a doubt as to whether the use of Library of Congress cards had ever resulted in a

reduction in the size of a cataloguing department. On a more respectable level the cataloguer will note that centralized cataloguing is more likely to be successful in replacing authors' initials by full names. When the centralized cataloguing agency also produces a trade bibliography then the entries will tend to contain details which are more appropriate to the second than the first function. Disregarding these minor points it can be repeated that centralized cataloguing does not need consideration in a discussion of the principles of cataloguing.

Cataloguing at source is perhaps a rather different matter. Under this proposal each book will contain at an appropriate place—usually the verso of the title page a full main catalogue entry for the book with indication of added entries. The scheme is at present only in an experimental stage. In the year 1958/59 1,000 books published in the United States will carry such catalogue entries. Many questions about the working of the scheme have not yet been answered. To the cataloguer the most important of these is the relationship between the publisher and author and the catalogue entry. If the catalogue entry is constructed by an outside cataloguer from information supplied by the publisher then the only difference between this and existing forms of centralized cataloguing is the method of distribution of the catalogue entry. But if the catalogue entry can be established by collaboration between cataloguer, publisher and author, then the position is radically changed. Pseudonymous books illustrate the difference at once. It would be stupid for one name to appear on the recto and another on the verso of the title page. The author will have to make up his mind whether he wishes to preserve a disguise or let it go. Married women, authors who use initials in place of full names or who omit some of their forenames, will be given the opportunity to consider the name under which they wish their works to be recorded. Once they have made a firm and considered decision the cataloguer will have no choice but to follow that decision. Cataloguing at source must tend to strengthen the viewpoint expressed earlier in this work.



Even more important will be the catalogue entry for works issued by corporate bodies. At present far too many title pages seem designed to conceal the author. There will be less point in the roll call of supporting and sponsoring organizations if the back of the title page contains a single statement of authorship or indication of lack of authorship. Too many realities disturb this happy dream of difficulties dissolved. All spring from the difference between the publisher's and the cataloguer's approach. A corporate body might be quite capable of deciding that all works by its officials should be entered under the name of the corporate body. It would support this decision by the familiar arguments and the strong conviction that what it paid for it should get the credit for. Even simplified rules for corporate entry are based on principles to which most corporate bodies pay no attention. An individual author deciding that his books should be entered under his name and initials or under an assumed form of name is making a decision for himself alone. The rules for corporate entry would still have to be based on uniform principles. Otherwise we should be back to a more sophisticated method of entering under the form of name found on the title page. It is hoping too much to hope that a corporate body would be capable of planning a catalogue entry which reconciled its own inside knowledge with cataloguing principles or even that it would be prepared to put aside those jealousies and clashes of interest which at present determine the lay-out of so many title pages. At this stage the most that seems likely is that cataloguing at source might induce a certain sense of increased responsibility in those who design title pages. Like all forms of centralized cataloguing, cataloguing at source could only produce its fullest advantages if the "source" catalogue entry is followed implicitly. Modification of any kind would lessen usefulness. A catalogue entry which could be received with such respect would need to be based on a universally accepted code and be carried out by cataloguers of the highest competence. Whether it would be possible to produce an authoritative entry under the condition



in which so many books are printed is at present an open question. It would be a source of interest to collectors but of frustration to cataloguers if some detail of the book were changed after the catalogue entry had been printed.

The physical form of the catalogue may appear unrelated to any question of cataloguing principle. Current practice is generally based on the assumption that a card catalogue is the only form meriting consideration. The difference between a sheaf catalogue and a card catalogue is purely mechanical. Both present each separate entry in isolation. The book catalogue presents a whole sequence of entries at a glance. It is easy to compare different entries and the practised eye can scan the pages of a book catalogue at a great speed not even pausing to read the unwanted entries but rejecting those almost automatically. The great merit of the card catalogue is complete flexibility. It is possible to maintain a card catalogue in perfect order because each card—or group of consecutive cards—is self contained. It is not possible to preserve more than a reasonably high degree of order in the book form but the advantages of greater ease of reference and of ordered presentation of a whole sequence of entries outweigh any slight untidiness. Many libraries in the United States are considering the possibility of reintroducing the book form and those older libraries in Great Britain who have never abandoned it are confident of its superiority over a card catalogue.

The principles of cataloguing are short and simple, and not much open to dispute. Many have suggested that dispute cannot be avoided when the time comes to apply the principles. One cataloguer has written: "The plain fact is that no set of basic functions and techniques can be set down so firmly and be so readily understood that anyone and everyone using it as a base will come always (or even most of the time) to the same inevitable decision about a particular problem." If this statement is correct then the cataloguer's task is hopeless for no code however elaborate can cover every possible exposition of a particular bibliographical relation. In fact it is not correct. Experience in

actual cataloguing shows that cataloguers working with no more than an agreed set of principles and not even the outline of a full code have arrived in the overwhelming majority of cases at the same answer to the same problem. There have been difficulties enough but these would not have been lessened by a fuller code. The fuller the code the greater the danger that a mechanical following of what appears to be a ready-made solution will take the place of the vital analysis of the essential character of a situation. And yet as has been admitted constantly in the preceding chapter, situations do arise which cannot be dealt with unhesitatingly on the basis of agreed principles. The soundness of the principle is not in doubt only the manner in which it should be applied. Such cases are not common and no good is done by trying too hard to bring them within a convincing logical framework. An arbitrary and authoritative decision does less harm when its arbitrary character is openly admitted. The perfect cataloguing code will be made up of nine-tenths obvious development of a few basic principles and one-tenth authoritarian cutting of the more involved Gordian Knots. The metaphor tends to be misleading. As the examples scattered throughout the preceding chapters show, in many cases what is needed is simply a final choice when arguments of equal weight can be put on each side.

Only harm can be done by setting standards which are impossibly high. No code can make certain that every book is everywhere catalogued in the same way. No catalogue can succeed always in bringing together all the works of one author or all editions of one work. What the cataloguer can hope to do is to construct a catalogue on such lines that it will be a source not of confusion but of instruction to its users. His reward if he achieves this end is a reward which will increase unceasingly. For those who use the catalogue are also those who create the other sources of bibliographical information with which the catalogue has to be integrated and it is they who by their ignorance and indifference create so many difficulties. The cataloguer has no more important task than to educate his masters.

## CHAPTER SIX

### References

THE earliest book on cataloguing which is still of value to the practising cataloguer is Cutter's *Rules for a dictionary catalog*. Fourth edition rewritten, 1904.

Read with care and discrimination Cutter's *Rules* are of the greatest value as he almost always manages to suggest the germ of the best solution of a problem, even though for some reason or other he often prefers a less satisfactory alternative. The *Cataloguing Rules. Author and title entries. Compiled by Committees of the Library Association and the American Library Association* first published in 1908 and reissued in facsimile reprints is referred to in the text by its popular title the Joint Code. It has been superseded by the *A.L.A. Cataloging Rules for author and title entries. Prepared by the Division of Cataloging and Classification of the American Library Association. Second edition. Edited by Clara Beetle*. 1949 which exhibits the same faults and the same virtues on a greatly magnified scale. This work is constantly referred to in the text as the ALA rules. The *Rules for compiling the catalogues of printed books, maps and music in the British Museum. Revised edition*, 1936 is in some ways a better constructed, more logically ordered and consequently far shorter code than any of these but could not in itself be made the basis for any modern catalogue.

A work which gives detailed comparisons of all the then existing codes is J. C. M. Hanson's *A Comparative Study of Cataloging Rules based on the Anglo-American code of 1908. With comments on the rules and on the prospects for a further extension of international agreement and co-operation*, 1939. This is a sound and laborious piece of work but its value to the student is lessened by its lack of functional analysis.

An introduction to the "modern" movement in cataloguing

## REFERENCES

can be found in the article "Some recent developments in cataloging in the U.S.A." by L. Jolley in the *Journal of Documentation*, Vol. 6, No. 2, p. 70-82. The most convenient exposition of recent thinking is the papers presented at the June 1956 Graduate Library School of the University of Chicago and published as Number 4 of Volume XXVI of the *Library Quarterly*.

The other indispensable source is Seymour Lubetzky's *Cataloging Rules and Principles. A critique of the A.L.A. rules for entry and a proposed design for their revision. Prepared for the Board on Cataloging Policy and Research of the A.L.A. Division of Cataloging and Classification*.

The following are other works specially used in specific chapter and works from which direct quotation are made.

### Chapter II

Joint-authorship. The quotation from Edith Somerville is taken from *The Listener* May 22, 1958.

Non-author headings. For discussion of this subject see Vol. X of the *Journal of Cataloging and Classification*, p. 61, Werner B. Ellinger "Non-author headings", p. 147, Seymour Lubetzky "Non-author headings: a negative theory", and p. 155, "Comment", by Ellinger on Lubetzky's reply.

Forms of corporate names. The discussions referred to will be found in Mortimer Taube's article in the *Library Quarterly*, Vol. 20, p. 1-20. Lubetzky's reply in Vol 21, p. 1-12 of the same journal and in Taube's rejoinder and Lubetzky's answer in the *Library of Congress Information Bulletin*, Vol. 10, Nos. 6 and 10. A summary of the debate together with the experiences of the D.S.I.R. will be found in R. M. Jacob's "Whodunnit", *Journal of Documentation*, Vol. 8, 1952, p. 227-31.

The Subject Catalogue. There are two very useful discussions of the subject catalogue with a conservative approach. The first is Miss Julia Pettee's *Subject headings: the*

*history and theory of the alphabetical subject approach to books*, 1946. The other is David Judson Haykin's *Subject headings. A practical guide*, Washington, 1951. This work was published for the Library of Congress where Mr Haykin was Chief of the Subject Cataloging Division. Mr Haykin was preparing a subject catalogue code which unfortunately he did not live to complete. All quotations from these two authors are taken from these two books.

A useful critical discussion is George Scheerer's "The subject catalog examined", *Library Quarterly*, Vol. 27, p. 187. A narrower but illuminating study is M. L. Prevost "An approach to theory and method in general subject heading", *Library Quarterly*, Vol. 16, p. 140.

The quotation from Lubetzky is from his article in *Library Quarterly*, Vol. 21, p. 1. The account of the subject cataloguing rules of the Library of Congress Science and Technology Project is to be found in the article by C. D. Gull on p. 83 of Vol. 40 of *Special Libraries*. The references to co-ordinate indexing and the quotations from Taube and Irma Wachtel are taken from *Studies in co-ordinate indexing*, 2 Vols., published in 1953 and edited by M. Taube.

# Index

Compiled by Dr. Muriel Lock, A.L.A.,  
Member of the Society of Indexers.

- Abbreviations 89, 135
- Added entries 12, 15, 23, 24, 28, 29,  
30, 31, 32, 47, 60, 61, 63, 70,  
81, 122, 134, 136
- Agreements 70
- Albany State Library, cataloguing  
policy 103
- Alphabetic-classed catalogues 108-9
- American Library Association 127
  - Cataloging rules: author and title entries*  
v, 2, 3, 7, 92, 126, 127
  - author entries 18, 21, 27, 38, 40,  
43, 47, 48, 52
  - anonymous and pseudonymous  
works 31-3, 35, 54
  - corporate 67, 71, 73, 84, 91,  
94, 96
  - societies and institutions 73
  - rules 3B, 27
    - 4A, 27
    - 12A (2), 22
    - 12F, 21-2
    - 13A, 15
    - 13C, 15, 66, 67
    - 19A-D, 24
    - 19E, 24
    - 20, 24
    - 27, 22, 23
    - 32, 31
    - 33, 35, 36
    - 33C (3), 37
    - 38, 41
    - 45, 50, 52
    - 46E, 49
    - 47, 39
    - 47B, 40
    - 52C, 47
    - 58, 39
    - 60, 39
    - 72, 78
    - 75, 91, 94-5
- 84, 69
- 85, 69
- 87, 70
- 92, 73
- 92B, 84
- 93B, 84
- 94, 84
- 100, 91
- 101, 91
- 102, 91, 93
- 106, 91
- 126, 91
- 140, 65
- 141, 65, 66
- title entries 35
- Anonymous works 16, 30-5, 52, 54,  
66, 128
  - biographies 17, 18-9
  - "classics" 35, 36, 37-8
- Anglo-American Joint Code 18, 19,  
21, 29, 47, 48, 52, 69, 78, 127
- revisions v
  - see also A.L.A. Cataloging rules:*  
*author and title entries*
  - rule 136, 128
- Annotations 88
- Annual reports 8, 61, 66
- Anthologies 20, 37
- Archives 72
- Artists 24
- Author 136
  - and title entries 13-4, 98, 126
  - catalogue 12-55, 98, 115
  - see also Name catalogue*
  - entry 12-6, 17, 20, 28-9, 36, 38, 68,  
72, 82, 126, 127
  - change of name 4, 5, 9, 48-52, 55
  - "conventional" 16
  - corporate 15, 16, 22, 27, 56-97
  - "correct" 68, 69
  - definition 17

# INDEX

- form of name 38-48
- joint 16, 24
- librettos 22
- mediaeval texts 39-40, 41
- multiple 16
- posthumous works 51
- principles governing 14-7, 19
- prefixes 42-3
- pseudonyms 9, 10, 52-5
  - undiscovered 52
- surnames 7, 39, 40, 41-2
  
- Baer, Karl A. 102
- Beetle, Clara, ed. *Cataloging Rules for author and title entries*, 1949, 140
- Bible: "conventional" title 14, 36, 38
- Bibliographical co-ordination, subject limitation 120
- Bibliographical tools 10
- Bibliographies 67, 100-1
- Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, catalogue 46
- Biographies, main entry 15, 17
  - anonymous 17, 18-9
- Bishops, form of entry 47-8
- Bookplates, armorial 24
- Brazil, compound names 42
- British Museum, catalogue of printed books 17, 68, 72, 82, 98
  - The Rules for compiling the catalogues of printed books, maps and music in the British Museum*, 1936, rev. ed. 19-20, 30, 31, 32, 33, 40, 41, 76
  - 15a, 19
  - 25, 131
  - anonymous and pseudonymous works 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 54
  - author entries 39, 43, 46, 49, 50, 56
  - Festschrift 19
  - subject entries 34
  - title entries 33, 65
  - Subject Index of Modern Works* 109
  - subject index policy 100
  - British National Bibliography* 102, 130, 133
  - index 121, 122, 123, 124
- Cataloguers 1, 3, 111, 117, 118-9, 125, 127, 137-8
  - 'author' concept 16-7
  - bibliographical knowledge 51, 52, 54, 55, 60, 67
  - literature consultation 9-10
  - principles, general 5, 17-8, 24, 28, 42, 43, 119
- Catalogues, and readers 1-2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 139
  - Arabic twelfth century 14-5
  - art galleries 67, 68
  - author 12-55
  - bibliographic value 2, 4, 5, 6, 10-1, 55, 57, 128, 139
  - British Museum 17, 68, 72, 82, 98
  - classified 102, 103-9, 114, 115, 116, 118, 123
  - dictionary 12, 13, 18, 52, 98, 103, 117, 123
  - efficiency appraisal 3-4
  - 'finding-lists' 4
  - function 1-11
  - library 15-6, 66, 67, 68, 72
    - Glasgow University viii
    - private collections 15, 66
  - physical form 138
  - printed 130, 133
  - sale 67
  - size 5, 115-6
  - subject 13, 52, 82, 98-125
  - thematic 21, 22
  - uniformity in 6, 14, 20, 38, 42, 50, 51
  - union 51
  - use 4-5
- Cataloguing, and bibliographical information 44, 45, 127, 130, 132, 133
  - at source 136-7
  - centralised 102, 130, 133, 135-6
  - collective 134-5
  - consistency in 6, 14, 20, 38, 42, 50, 55, 60, 79
  - co-operative 2-3
  - costs 3-4
  - definition 7, 13-4
  - department 4
  - descriptive 6, 126-34
  - functional approach 30
  - literature relating to v, 140-2
  - machinery, use 3
  - periodicals 7
  - policy formulation 5-8, 17-8, 24, 28, 42, 43
  - principles, general v, viii, 3, 4-5, 10-1, 71, 72, 93, 95, 116, 138-9

# INDEX

- profession 1
- 'simplified' 3, 4, 134
- special collections 10
- staff *see* Cataloguers
- theory v, 72
- uniformity 42, 43
  - see also* under specific heads
- Cataloging rules: author and title entries*
  - see* American Library Association
- Categories 3
- Catchwords 65
- Catholic Encyclopaedia* 40
- Censuses 70-1
- Chain indexing 121-2, 123, 124
- Charters 83-4, 86
  - author entry 70
- Chicago University, Graduate Library
  - School papers 141
- Class marks 105, 106, 121-2
- Classification 2, 102, 103-5, 107, 108, 109, 114, 121, 123, 124
  - Decimal 103
  - Dewey 121, 123
  - terminology 124-5
- Classified catalogues, alphabetico-classed 108
  - systematic 102, 103-9, 114, 115, 116, 118
- Codes v, 2, 3, 5, 7, 11, 18, 135, 139, 140
  - see also* American Library Association. *Cataloging rules: author and title entry*
- Anglo-American Joint Code
- Codification 7, 13-4
- Collation 132, 135
- Commentaries 15, 24
- Committees 17, 91
  - ad hoc* 92
  - joint 97
  - sub- 97
- A comparative study of cataloging rules based on the Anglo-American code of 1908... 1939.* J. C. M. Hanson 140
- Compilers 15-6, 21, 22, 23, 37, 67
- Composers 22
- Composite works 19, 24, 27
- Concealed subject entry 33
- Concordances 21
- Conferences 62, 70
- Congress, Library of *see* Library of Congress
- Constitutions 69
- "Conventional author" heading 16, 19, 21
- "Conventional title" heading 14, 16, 19, 21, 35-6, 37, 38, 68, 71
- Corporate authorship 15, 16, 27, 56-97
  - cataloguing at source 137-8
  - change of name 83-4, 86-90
  - music publishers 22
  - subordinate bodies 80-1, 90-4
- "Correct" author 68, 69
- Criminal trials 71, 72
- Cross references 5, 70, 104, 105, 110, 114-5, 117, 122
- 'Custom', principle of entry 38, 39, 43, 52, 54-5, 84
- Cutter, Charles Ammi, cataloguing
  - principles viii, 3, 6, 18, 22, 56, 57, 73, 84, 90, 91, 95, 99, 104, 111, 114, 119, 135
- Rules for a dictionary catalog* (1904) 98, 140
  - rule 175, 117
- Date of imprint 128, 131
- Descriptions, corporate author headings 64
- Descriptive cataloguing 6, 126-34
- Dictionary catalogues 12, 13, 18, 52, 98, 103, 117, 123
  - subject headings 18
- Dictionary of National Biography* 47
- Display 2
- Distinctive name 73-7, 78
- Double entry 111, 112, 117
- Ecclesiastics, form of entry 47-8
- Editions 4
  - correlation of 5, 9, 10, 16, 19, 36, 37, 60, 64, 68, 71, 129, 133, 139
  - revised 24-6
- Editors 5, 22, 25-6, 27, 28, 29, 63, 129, 131
- Einführung in die Katalogkunde*, Karl Löffler 33
- Electronic information retrieval 3
- Encyclopaedia Britannica* 40
- Entries 2, 4-5, 135, 136
  - added 12, 15, 23, 24, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 47, 60, 61, 63
  - author 4, 5, 7, 9, 12-6, 17, 20, 22, 24, 27, 28-9, 36, 38-52, 55, 56-97, 126, 127



# INDEX

- chain indexing 121-2, 123, 124
- double 111, 112, 117
- main 5, 12, 28, 29, 70
- serial 60
- sources for 9
- specific 111-2, 113, 114, 116
- standardized 134
- subject 4, 5, 6, 12, 13, 16, 17, 19, 33, 34, 36-7, 72, 115
- title 5, 7-8, 11, 13-4, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 28-9, 30, 33, 34-8, 63, 68, 70, 71, 81, 98, 115, 126
- Epitomes 24
- Essays, collective 20
- 'Finding list': concept of catalogues 4
- Form headings 5, 69, 70, 71, 72
- Fortescue, G. K. 109
- France, rules for entry of noblemen 46
- Germany, cataloguing policy 34, 102
- Glasgow, University Library catalogue viii
- Government departments 79-80, 94-5
- sponsorship of works 59-60
- Government publications 78, 80-2, 83, 97
- Gull, C. D. 118, 119, 122, 142
- Hanson, J. C. M. *A comparative study of cataloguing rules based on the Anglo-American code of 1908* ... 1939, 140
- Harvard University Library, cataloguing principles 70, 92
- Haykin, D. J. 103, 112, 113, 115, 116, 117, 124, 142
- Headings 126, 129
  - author 12-4, 15, 17, 38, 50, 57, 64, 98, 128
  - corporate 58, 59, 82, 88, 89, 94, 95, 96
  - 'conventional' 14, 16, 19, 21, 35-6, 37, 38, 68
  - 'form' 5, 69, 70, 71, 72
  - government publications 80-1
  - inverted 76, 77
  - 'natural' 5, 6, 17, 34, 77, 84, 85, 109-10
  - 'non-author' 68, 71, 72
  - specific 111-2, 113, 114, 116, 117, 118
  - sub- 90, 91-3, 110, 113, 117
  - subject 4, 5, 6, 16, 33, 34, 99, 104, 105, 107, 109-10, 111, 117, 118-20, 121, 122, 123, 125
  - concealed 33
  - title 14
  - 'useful' 71
- Henkle, H. H. *Studies of descriptive cataloging* (1946) 127-8
- H.M.S.O. Departmental Lists 82
- Holland, 'undiscovered' pseudonyms 52
- Illustrations 132-3, 134
- Illustrators 24, 129, 131
- Indexes and indexing 99, 124
  - British National Bibliography* 121, 122, 123, 124
  - principles of 5, 21, 23-4
  - subject catalogues 105, 106-7, 108, 119, 122, 123
  - uniterm method 119-20
- Information retrieval, electronic 3
- Institutions 73, 87, 91, 93-6
  - government 78
  - national 77, 78-9, 84-5, 86
- 'Intellectual responsibility': principle of author entry 14, 15, 16-7, 21, 26, 57, 59, 64, 66, 70
- International Federation of Library Associations v
- Inverted headings 76, 77
- Italy, prefixes 43
- Joint authorship 16, 20, 22, 24, 26, 52
- Joint Code see Anglo-American Joint Code
- Jolley, L. *Some recent developments in cataloguing in the U.S.A.* 141
- Journals see Periodicals
- Laws 69-70
- Lectures 63
- Libraries, author entry 77, 78, 84
  - catalogues viii, 17, 68, 72, 82, 115, 129
  - rules for entry 15-6, 66, 67, 68, 72
- Library Association of Great Britain. *Cataloguing rules: author and title entries* see Anglo-American Joint Code
- Library of Congress, cards 135-6
- catalogue 115, 129

# INDEX

- cataloguing policy 9, 20, 86, 106, 113, 116, 120, 126-7, 129-30, 132, 133
- "no-conflict" rule 44, 45, 134
- rules 3A, 128
- 3:10, 130
- 3:12 B2, 131
- Rules for descriptive cataloguing in the Library of Congress* (1949) 126-7, 128, 130, 131, 132, 133-4
- Science and Technology Project 102-3, 118, 119, 142
- List of Subject Headings*, 2, 115, 118, 119
- Libretti, opera 22
- List of Subject Headings*, Library of Congress 2, 115, 118, 119
- Löffler, Karl. *Einführung in die Katalogkunde* 33
- Lubetzky, Seymour viii, 114, 141, 142
- Cataloguing rules and principles: a critique of the A.L.A. rules...* (1953) v, viii, 5, 13, 14, 73, 86, 114, 141
- Main entry 5, 12, 28, 29, 70
- see also Author, Subject, Title, etc. headings
- Married women 42, 48, 49, 50-1, 54, 55, 136
- Mediaeval texts 7, 11, 38, 39-40, 41, 98
- Medicine, text-books 25-6
- Meetings, reports and proceedings 62, 63, 65-6, 70
- Memorial works 19
- Monographs 23
- Multiple authorship 16, 20, 26-30
- Music 22
- Name catalogue 12-3, 18, 52
- change of 4, 5, 9, 48-52, 55, 56, 83-4, 86-90
- entry 4, 5, 9, 11, 18, 72
- form of 46-8, 65, 73, 82, 86, 136
- abbreviations 89
- Arabic 11
- 'association' concept 17, 67, 70
- 'best known' 89
- 'distinctive' 73-7, 78, 96
- mediaeval 11, 39-40, 41
- place 74-7
- pseudonyms 9, 10, 52-5
- surnames 7, 39, 40, 41-2
- variant forms 11, 82, 87
- 'Natural headings' 5, 6, 17, 19, 20, 34, 77, 84, 85, 109-10
- "no-conflict" rule, Library of Congress 44, 45, 134
- Noblemen 45-7, 55
- "Non-author headings" 68, 71, 72
- see also Subject, Title, etc. entries
- Norme per il catalogo degli stampati* (1931), Vatican Library 98
- Notation: classification 102, 124
- "Official" names 84
- "Official" records 72
- Osborn, Andrew viii
- Owners, index 24
- Panizzi, Sir Anthony, 1841 rules 56
- Parliamentary papers 82
- Parish registers 72
- Periodicals, cataloguing policy 7-8, 23, 126
- change of title 8
- series 28
- symposia 63
- indexes to 7, 100
- Perkins, F. B. 104
- Pettee, Julia 103, 111, 112-3, 115, 116, 117, 122, 123, 141-2
- Pettus, Clyde E. *Subject headings in education* 104
- Place names 74-7
- Poems, mediaeval anonymous: "conventional title" 14
- Popes 48
- Posthumous works 51
- Prevost, M. L. 117-8, 120
- Private collections 15, 66
- Prussia. *Instruktionen für die alphabetischen Kataloge...*, title entries 33
- Pseudonyms and pseudonymous works 9, 10, 31-3, 52-5, 128, 136
- Publishers 22, 61, 129, 130, 136
- music 22
- Ranganathan, S. R., chain indexing 121
- Readers, use of catalogues 1-2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 12, 30, 32, 41, 50, 71, 100-2, 105, 106, 107, 108, 115-6, 116, 133, 139
- concept of headings 6, 18, 20, 22, 28, 99, 112-3, 117

# INDEX

- Readers' adviser 113
- References 140-2
- Reports, administrative 57-8
  - annual 8, 61, 66
  - committee 17, 91, 92
  - government department 59-60, 80
  - society 59-60
  - special subject 58
- Revisions 24-5
- Rules, principles of formulation 6, 32
  - 'custom' 38, 39, 43, 52, 54-5
  - exceptions 3, 9, 52, 61, 73, 111
  - see also A.L.A. *Cataloging rules: author and title entry*; British Museum; Cutter; Lubetsky; Prussia; Schwartz, Van Hoesen
- Rules for a dictionary catalog* (1904) C. A. Cutter 98, 140
- Rules for compiling the catalogues of printed books, maps and music in the British Museum, rev. ed.* 1936, 140
  - see also under British Museum
- Rules for descriptive cataloging in the Library of Congress* (1949) 126-7, 128, 130, 131, 132, 133-4
- Russia, state-supported editions 61
- Saints 39, 40
- Sale catalogues 67
- Schwartz, J. 117
- Selections see Anthologies
- Series 62
  - entry 28, 60
- Shelf arrangement 107, 108
- Shelf lists 106
- Shera, Jesse H. 108
- Ship's logs 71
- Simplified cataloguing 3, 4, 134
- Societies 73, 74
  - affiliated 91
  - change of name 9, 83-4, 86-8
  - defunct 86
  - sponsorship of works 59-60
  - symposia 27
- Some recent developments in cataloguing in the U.S.A.* L. Jolley 141
- Spain, state-supported editions 61
- Special collections 10
- Specific entry 111-2, 113, 114, 116, 117, 118, 119, 122
- "sponsorship" 59-63
- Staff, assistance to readers 2, 113
- Studies of descriptive cataloging*, H. H. Henkle 127-8
- Study groups 58-9
- Sub-division 109, 113-4, 117, 118
  - geographical 75, 114
- Sub-headings 90, 91-3, 110, 113
- Subject catalogues 13, 52, 82, 98-125
  - as bibliographies 102
  - dictionary 18
  - division by date 125
  - U.S.A. 102
- entries 4, 12, 13, 16, 34, 36-7, 115
- anonymous biography 17, 19
- 'concealed' 13, 33, 72
- definition 17
- 'natural' 5, 6, 17, 34
- heading catalogues 102-3, 104, 105, 111-7, 122, 123, 124
- headings 4, 5, 6, 16, 33, 34, 99, 104, 105, 107, 109-10, 111, 117, 118-20, 121, 122, 125
- indexes and indexing 105, 106-7, 108, 119, 122, 123
  - chain 121-2, 123, 124
  - uniterm 119-20
- Subject headings in education*, Clyde E. Pettus 104
- Subject Index of Modern Works*, British Museum 109-10
- Subordinate bodies 80-1, 90-4
- Surnames 7, 41-2
- Symposia 27, 62, 63
- Taube, Mortimer 86, 95, 103, 119, 141
- Terms, change in meaning 124
- Thematic catalogues 21, 22
- Thomas, H. 110
- Title-page 25, 27, 59, 61, 62, 63, 80, 82, 83, 86, 88, 128, 131, 132, 134, 136, 137
- Title 128-9
  - abbreviation of 135
  - change of 4, 5, 8, 10, 25
  - collective 29
  - entries 14, 21, 28-9, 36, 68, 70, 71, 115
  - anonymous works 30, 33, 34-8
  - anthologies 20, 37
  - author and title 13-4, 98, 126
  - biographies 18, 19
  - 'conventional' 14, 16, 19, 21, 35-6, 37, 38, 68, 71

# INDEX

- government publications 81
- lectures 63
- policy 5, 7, 11, 15, 38
- scientific symposia 63
- nomenclature, standardization 37
- periodicals 7-8
- Translations 11, 24, 38
- Translators 129, 131, 134
- Treaties 70
- U.S.A., cataloguing at source 136
- catalogues 102, 138
- classification policy 108
- policy 5, 103, 106
- title entries 5
- see also* Library of Congress
- Uniterm method 119-20
- Universities 76, 85, 89, 96
- subordinate bodies 93-4
- 'Useful' headings 71
- Van Hoesen, H. B. 117
- Vatican Library, *Norme per il catalogo degli stampati* (1931) 98
- Wachtel, Irma S. 108
- Wills 72
- World List of Scientific Periodicals* 7, 8





*"A book that is shut is but a block"*

CENTRAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL LIBRARY

GOVT. OF INDIA  
Department of Archaeology  
NEW DELHI.

Please help us to keep the book  
clean and moving.

---

S. N. 129. N. DELHI.